DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 635 EA 028 711

AUTHOR	Rollow, Sharon G.; Bennett, Michael
TITLE	Parents' Participation and Chicago School Reform: Issues of Race, Class and Expectations.
INSTITUTION	Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, Madison, WI.; Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1996-06-00
NOTE	71p.
CONTRACT	R117Q0005-95
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; Black Students; Case Studies; *Community Involvement; Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Elementary Education; Expectation; Instructional Leadership; *Parent Participation; *Participative Decision Making; *Principals; Racial Differences; School Based Management; School Restructuring; Social Class; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Chicago Public Schools IL; *Local School Councils; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

Most studies of the early implementation of Chicago (Illinois) school reform have focused on the creation and early functioning of the Local School Councils (LSCs). This study is concerned with understanding the resources that different school communities have to embrace the LSC reform, the time frame needed to promote educational change, and the patterns of school micropolitics LSCs stimulate. Case study analysis of one poor, racially isolated elementary school in an African-American community is used to explore these issues. The intricate patterns of relationships among parents and community members on the LSCs and between the LSCs and the school principal were studied for over 5 years, from the first LSC in 1989-90. When reform was first passed, the school was characterized as a patriarchal family with the principal firmly in charge, a situation that was acceptable to all aspects of the school community, but one that was in conflict with the active decision making for parents supported by at least some of Chicago's reform advocates. Tracing the actions of the LSCs through the first three elected councils does not indicate that parents ever wanted, much less assumed, a strong governance role or much influence in educational issues. However, the LSC was effective in solving school-based problems such as building-security issues and the adequacy of the lunchroom food. The LSC also became a vehicle that allowed some parents to develop civic participation skills. By the third LSC, parents were strategizing with the principal to get things done. Key to understanding events at this school was understanding the actions of the principal, whose effectiveness was based on mutual trust and caring with the school community. His leadership was good for the school, although it was not clear that it would promote educational reforms in the future. (Contains 52 references.) (SLD)

ED 412 635

PARENTS' PARTICIPATION AND CHICAGO SCHOOL REFORM: ISSUES OF RACE, CLASS AND EXPECTATIONS

Sharon G. Rollow
Center for School Improvement
University of Chicago

Michael Bennett
Jane Addams School of Social Work
University of Illinois at Chicago

FINAL DELIVERABLE

June 1996

This paper was prepared at the Center of Organization and Restructuring of Schools supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Grant No. R117Q0005-95) and by the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison. The opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of supporting agencies. The authors are grateful for the comments and insights provided by Diana Slaughter Defoe on an earlier draft of this work.

EA 028 711

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PARENTS' PARTICIPATION AND CHICAGO SCHOOL REFORM: ISSUES OF RACE, CLASS AND EXPECTATIONS

INTRODUCTION

One summer evening in 1988, shortly after Chicago's school reform legislation (Public Act 45-1418) was passed, eleven veteran community organizers came together at a meeting of the Community Workshop on Economic Development to discuss the status of citizen's empowerment and organizing efforts in the city, and potential links that might be made to school reform.[1] Collectively these individuals had spent decades in a variety of community-based organizations (CBOs) in the city, working primarily on issues of housing, safety, economic and community development, welfare and health reform. They were concerned with the fragmentation of the Rainbow Coalition following Mayor Washington's death two years earlier.[2] They were also alarmed by the diminution of funding for organizing efforts,[3] the alarming deterioration of inner city neighborhoods, the development of an "underclass," and the increasing difficulties of organizing in "truly disadvantaged" communities.[4] One participant noted:

> The overwhelming combination of deprivation, disorganization, and communal depression has created a far tougher environment than most of us ever faced when we began organizing in the 1960's and 1970's.

While these individuals were not among those advocates directly associated with the mobilization and passage of Chicago school reform, they were interested in the rhetoric surrounding it. Some of this talk--and especially the conversation about the parent-dominated Local School Councils (LSC)--reminded them of the community control movement of New York City in the late 1960's. They were intrigued by the potential of PA 85-1418 to rally and organize parents and community members in poor, neighborhoods.[5] Moreover, these organizers noted that the school

reform legislation was regarded as Harold Washington's legacy by many of the people that they hoped to mobilize, since he was developing a reform bill that would give parents more voice in school decision-making when he died.[6] They noted too that the city as a whole had embraced reform.[7] They had not witnessed such positive energy for change since the voter's registration drive that spearheaded Washington's mayoral campaign several years earlier.

Consequently, the community organizers opened their meeting with discussion of issues that were related to but different from that of the reform's most vocal advocates. The latter group--which included some of the authors of the legislation--argued that parents' election to LSCs and involvement in school governance would improve the educational opportunities afforded students of urban schools.[8] Moreover, to add muscle to the legislation and a press for local school participants to embrace it, they mandated that the goals of Chicago's reform--including a provision that students reach national norms on standardized test scores--be achieved within a five year time frame.[9] The community organizers, in contrast, wanted to know if participation on LSCs might help parents to develop some of the leadership and "citizenship skills"[10] necessary to a revitalization of community organizing. Their hope was that some councils might develop as high functioning democratic institutions, and serve as a model for the reconstitution of local democratic institutions more generally.

Abraham Abernee, a seasoned organizer in the city, opened up the discussion. At first, he did not see reform as the rallying issue. He suggested: "The resident housing management movement among tenants of public housing could invigorate grass-roots organizing among the poor in this city." But Bill Stringe, one of the original foot soldiers for Saul Alinsky's organizing efforts in Chicago's Woodlawn neighborhood thirty years earlier, disagreed. He worried that

> This [the resident housing management movement] might be too limited. Too many people--even poor people--want to distance themselves from public housing and that's the focus of Resident Management Corporations. But this school reform movement might just be the thing to stimulate some of the excitement of those pre-Harold days.[11]. . .Everybody is interested in kids and schools.

Another participant built upon Stringe's remarks. He proclaimed: "This school reform movement is going to bring the Chicago School of organizing back from the grave." By "Chicago School" he meant the confrontational approach of the late Alinsky. Organizing in some of Chicago's working-class neighborhoods in the 1930's, 40's and 50's, Alinsky acted on the premise that power is never given by the "haves," but must be taken by the "have-nots." The very process of identifying an enemy, challenging him personally, and then winning was seen as a way to enhance the self-esteem of rank-and-file-citizens, and create opportunities to develop their potential first as participants and eventually as leaders in a democratic society.[12]

The conversation among the organizers that night reached an eventual consensus. They reasoned that in truly disadvantaged African American communities it was unlikely that any single issue could catalyze the energies and sustain the effort of indigenous people.[13] But participation on LSCs might be an important exercise in community education. If some LSCs developed into self-governing, participatory institutions, then parents' experience here might help them to launch efforts that could encompass not only issues of education, but also a reform of welfare, health reform, safety, housing rehabilitation, and economic re-investment down the road.[14]

*****

To date, most of the investigation of the early implementation of Chicago school reform has focused on the creation and early functioning of LSCs.[15] Our own work has been concerned with understanding the resources that different school communities have to embrace this particular

legislation;[16] the time frame that is needed to promote educational changes;[17] and the different patterns of school micro-politics stimulated by it.[18] Largely unexamined is what the community organizers regarded as a potential, albeit indirect effect of this legislation to stimulate citizen's participation, skill and leadership development in disadvantaged neighborhoods and any spillover that there might be to a broader community renewal. We use case study analysis of Holiday,[19] which is a poor, racially isolated, African American school community, to explore each of these issues.

As background to our analyses, however, we note as one of the participants at the meeting did, that the current context for citizen empowerment efforts is different than it was in the 1960's and 70's because the nature and degree of urban disadvantage--"the overwhelming combination of deprivation, disorganization and communal depression"--has worsened in some urban communities. This seems to us a critical observation, because if it is accurate, it suggests that the relationships and resources necessary for local school communities to enact this reform specifically, and to invest in community organizing efforts more generally, may be very limited in some places. We have argued elsewhere that the heart of Chicago's legislation is the opportunity that it provides in each local school community for parents and community members to work with school professionals to chart and govern their own future.[20] The development of participatory politics and school improvement both depend on the interest, enthusiasm, resources and capacities of local school communities to engage it.[21] If the organizer cited above is right, however, and if the present urban context is "a far tougher environment"--characterized by disorganization and depression rather than interest and enthusiasm--then we question the adequacy of this reform to serve as a catalyst for either of these aims.

Our interest in the context and resources for reform raises a number of related issues. In *Making Democracy Work* Putnam writes about the development of different patterns of community

politics.[22] He describes the "vertical" relationships that characterize the most economically disadvantaged communities that he studied. Politics in such communities tends to be top-down--controlled by either a paternalistic or authoritarian leader. Putnam contrasts these with more prosperous communities where "horizontal" relationships have developed over time and prevail. Putnam describes a vibrant participatory democracy in these communities. He suggests that their politics and relative economic advantage may, in fact, be based in part on the evolution of collaborative work structures and networks of extended and enduring social relationships.

Similarly, in their writing about the politics that are emerging in Chicago school communities during the early implementation of reform, Bryk, et al.[23] introduce two relevant patterns. The first, "consolidated principals' power," is consistent with Putnam's idea of a vertically organized society where a paternalistic leader makes decisions:

> Principal leadership in these schools tend to take one of two forms. In some schools autocratic principals rule by private coercion; other schools tend to function more like families where the principal is a paternal/maternal figure.[24]

While the pattern of consolidated principals power has been found across the city, it is most prevalent in school communities where the base of human, social, fiscal and intellectual resources at the start of reform are weakest.

Bryk et al. contrast consolidated principals' power with "strong democracy." This is an inclusive and participatory politics where there is on-going and public debate about the norms and values that will organize a small society. They also find a willingness among members of the polity to sustain collaborative work toward mutually agreed upon goals. Such politics tend to be developing in school communities where there are strong intellectual resources among professional staff, and good relationships between parents and professionals.[25]

We introduce Putnam's and Bryk et al's. ideas to frame our investigation of one typical, inner city Chicago school community. It is likely that the two conceptualizations may be helpful in understanding the politics, relationships, roles and resources in this particular community.

Below we describe the Holiday school community when reform was first introduced. We then focus on the intricate pattern of relationships that existed among parents and community members on the Local School Councils and between those Councils and their principal over a five year period. Prior to a description of reform's unfolding in this school community, we offer some background about the broader community that Holiday serves.[26]

The Community Context

Demographic and economic indicators

Holiday Elementary School is located in one of Chicago's most disadvantaged neighborhoods.[27] This area has been home to some of the city's poorest residents for more than a century. In the 1850's an early industrial boom sparked growth in the area, and the population doubled between 1853 and 1856. During the 1860's and 1870's it doubled again. German, Irish, and Scandinavian immigrants were the first to arrive. They came to live near the rail yards, foundries and mills that sprung up on the southern and eastern edges of the community. But by the early 1900's, many of these first settlers were able to afford better housing further west. Italians, Poles, Russian Jews, and Greeks replaced them. The building of additional plants, warehouses, and wholesale houses accompanied this second wave.[28] It was at this time that Jane Addams and her associates founded Hull House. This became a base from which reformers launched actions intended to address issues of poor housing, education, and labor exploitation that many of these new residents faced.[29]

By 1920 this stream of immigration had reached its peak at 200,000. The population has declined steadily ever since.

African Americans first began to arrive in significant numbers after World War I. It was the massive northern migration following World War II, however, that sparked a huge influx. Between 1930 and 1960, the African American population increased from 17% to 50%. Today, African Americans comprise 75% of the 57,000 population.[30]

Each successive wave of immigrants occupied the worn housing of their predecessors. So by the time African Americans took over, the housing stock was 60 to 70 years old. In the 1950's the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA) was established. This new agency razed huge numbers of these "workingman's cottages," and replaced them with high-rise public housing. This was originally intended as temporary shelter for the working families who would save their money and move to better neighborhoods much like the immigrants that had preceded them. The development of these projects, however, coincided with a number of events, both economic and social, that left them racially isolated and disinvested.

"White flight" had been a problem since the fifties. It dramatically accelerated following King's assassination in the spring of 1968. In Chicago there was terrible rioting in several project neighborhoods. Stores were burned and looted and it was then that the remaining white businesses packed and left "seemingly overnight." Since jobs left with the local businesses, unemployment soared and poverty worsened. By 1970 the area that included the Holiday school community ranked second poorest in the city and fourth poorest within the 8-county area.[31] By 1990 unemployment topped 19%, and ranked 15th among the nation's poorest neighborhoods that year. Only 8% of the 3,000 project residents were employed, and more than 70% were living at or below the poverty-level

in single female headed households.[32] Rather than providing temporary housing and a stepping stone to something better, the projects had become a reservation for poor, African American families who were welfare-dependent.[33] Mr. Radner, Holiday's principal, described them as a "wasteland" that "should be bombed." Actually, Vincent Lane, the director of CHA at the time this case was being researched, planned to "de-densify" several of the complexes by demolishing the most seriously deteriorated buildings.[34]

Struggle for survival

Beyond the economic indicators, what is life like for the families whose children presently attend Holiday School? Gangs are rampant in the projects and they bring drugs, crime and violence into the community. "These kids around here see everything--murders, rapes, folks dead from overdoses," said LaDonna Hall, Holiday's first LSC chair, and a single mother. The biggest problem is the escalating gang war between the Gangster Disciples and the Vice Lords. They fight for control of "turf" and the drug traffic and prostitution associated with it. Boys as young as eight and nine are recruited to the gangs. They are intimidated and/or killed if they shun affiliations. Recruitment accelerates during the adolescent years, and increasingly girls are being targeted.

In 1993 Mrs. Hall lost her oldest son in a gang-related shooting. Since then, in addition to her duties on the LSC, she has become a speaker throughout the community and on the local access television stations in her effort to stop the violence. She is not alone. John Applegate, for example, directs a community-based, gang-intervention program in the neighborhood. As a youth he was associated with one of the gangs that preceded the Disciples. But, he talks with alarm about how the gangs, and the nature of their violence, has changed over the years:

These turf battles [today] aren't like those that we used to know as kids. Then, we

> would scuffle with intruders from other neighborhoods. Now, there is killing among young adults from the same neighborhood and it's all over drugs.[35]

Needless to say, youth are not the only casualties. Older residents are victim to the "spill-over effects" of the supply and demand tensions of the drug trade. Seniors are easy marks for drug-using robbers, purse snatchers, and burglars who represent the demand side. As Applegate explains:

> When the two prominent gangs are warring over the territorial rights to sell drugs in various public housing buildings, everyone is vulnerable--gang folk and non-gang folk, young and old--because bullets have no eyes.

Limited social resources

In communities like Holiday's violence takes its toll on social relations too. Increasingly distrust, hostility and fear distance people from each other. This is well illustrated in Kotlowitz's recent book *There are No Children Here*.[36] It is a chronicle of one youth's life, and that of his family, in a CHA complex. When the author asks Pharaoh to tell him about his friends, the twelve-year-old is perplexed by the question and hesitant to reply. He reminds Kotlowitz that boys do not live long in the projects and so there are few lasting friendships. He suggests too that even those individuals who do survive are not trustworthy because they are susceptible to gang recruitment. "I have no friends," Pharaoh tells him. "Only associates." In a community where childhood friendships may not even take root, it is unlikely that we will see the kind of "horizontal" and enduring relationships that are the bedrock of the small democracies that Putnam describes.

In such an environment, where residents are so profoundly alienated from each other, they must increasingly rely on external agencies for support. In the projects, these agencies are primarily the Chicago Police Department (CPD) and the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA). Residents hold limited expectations, however, that the police will "serve and protect" rather than brutalize them.

This is a neighborhood where community-police relations are severely strained as too many residents feel that they have been harassed, disrespected or ignored in times of need by the men and women in blue.[37]

Occasionally, however, the police do have a positive impact on neighborhood safety. These times tend to coincide with the calendar of sports events at the old Chicago Stadium.[38] Applegate observed:

> It is curious how the police can secure a five block area around the stadium just prior to game time. . .up until two o'clock on the day of the game old women can't go to the grocery store without being accosted by vagrants or punks. But, about two o'clock, plain clothed policemen start weaving throughout the blocks, flashing their badges and moving the unsightly and the criminally suspect. . . by five or six o'clock, the streets are so clean that you can take a nap on the sidewalk.

Residents must also rely on the CHA. Unfortunately, corruption there dates back to the agency's inception. It has been chronicled for decades in the newspapers, TV documentaries, books and the reports of "blue ribbon" panels that every new Chicago mayor commissions. Each independent study concludes that the project are "in disarray" and "out of control." Elevators in the high-rises are unsafe on those rare occasions when they work, plumbing is in disrepair, the heating systems mal-function, and the electric wiring is in dangerous violation of city code.

These physical conditions are well described in Kotlowitz' book. Pharaoh's mother recalls the parks and playgrounds that greeted her as a little girl when her family first moved into one of the newly built complexes. Decades later this equipment is missing, busted or rusted, and the grassy areas have long since been paved over by cement that is covered with litter and broken glass. As bad as these conditions are, gangs pose the real threat. Increasingly it is the gangs rather than CHA security who control the common areas and tightly monitor their use. Older youth like Pharaoh and

his brother LaFayette know to stay indoors. Young mothers keep their babies inside.

Civic life

Isolated in their apartments, residents of many of the projects are not only cut off from each other but from many forms of civic life as well. Unable to stem the violence in their neighborhood, many grow despondent over their inability to influence anything in their environment or to believe that their community's problems can be solved. This belief fosters an apathy that today even extends to church membership, which has been a traditional forum for organization, activism and debate in the African American community for centuries.

> The likelihood of belonging to a church or community organization is 20 percent lower for residents of the neighborhoods with the highest poverty rates, even though churches have been historically the institutional backbone of black communities, especially since commercial and governmental institutions have abandoned them.[39]

Community-based organizations (CBOs), once thriving in many of Chicago's black neighborhoods, are also in short supply and the few that do still operate are viewed by many residents with suspicion. In the past these CBO's were a training ground for the leadership development of indigenous people. Presently, however, there is a widespread perception that these organizations and their leadership are more motivated by self-interest than the community's and children's best interest. One example that was repeatedly mentioned to us took place in 1991. School professionals and parents found themselves at loggerheads with their alderman and a local CBO about the location of a new, residential halfway house for prisoners who needed to be moved out of the overcrowded county jail system. At an LSC meeting that fall Mr. Radner, the principal, alerted his community:

> The city is planning to put a work release program in the Public Aid Building across the street. As you know, this is very close to the school. They are planning to have 200 convicts stay there and these people could be burglars, rapists. . .I don't think they will be murders, but I don't know.

Radner called for LSC members to recruit other concerned parents and residents and join the faculty at a meeting of the zoning board downtown. Forging a united front, they argued that the facility should not be located so close to the school. Radner explained: "It's not that I'm against these kinds of programs or rehabilitation. It just should not be next to a school."

Mrs. Hall concurred: "This is a terrible thing to happen. . .This program would be like setting these kids up for trouble."

According to testimony at the zoning board hearings, the alderman and representatives of the CBO thought that it would bring new jobs into the community. This prospect far outweighed any potential threat to children and the neighborhood. They won and the program moved in. One Holiday parent summed it up this way: "We were defeated and deflated." Residents relate that experiences like these affirm and deepen their overall feeling of powerlessness and alienation.

We are also told of a community association's failed attempt to influence political and economic decisions on behalf of community residents. Shortly after the experience with the halfway house, Jobs Action Now (JAN) was funded by a city-wide entity to plan and execute "job actions." This was a tactic developed decades earlier by Alinsky. One of his objectives was to mobilize rank-in-file citizens to participate in direct confrontations with "the establishment" to impact the projects and policies that would directly effect their lives. Success is dependant on the organizers' abilities to catalyze a cadre of indigenous people toward a vigorous and sustained battle with the power brokers. But there is a Catch-22. Before most people will invest in such an action, they must be convinced that they stand a chance to "win."

In Alinsky's day most job actions were framed in class terms--a battle between the "haves" and the "have-nots." In contrast, organizers who use this tactic today typically frame it in racial terms.

For example, JAN targeted the white-owned construction company that won a major contract for a new public works project near Holiday. It demanded that more black, community residents be hired on the project.

The job action failed in the Holiday community because so few residents were willing to participate. It appears that most perceived the "power structure" to be invincible. In fact, they were resigned to the idea that coincident with the building of the new complex, a massive effort to displace them was imminent. One unemployed man, who was a fixture around the neighborhood, said:

> the long range plan is to remove the poor people from this area and build some upscale housing to match the new upscale sports arena that is under construction. . . the word going around is if they start to dig up the sidewalk in front of your building, just pack your bags because it means that pretty soon you'll be out of here.

In contrast to its successes in other areas of the city, JAN failed to rally residents of the Holiday school community. Residents were apathetic and their behavior provides evidence to prove the theory of the community activists cited at the outset. Overwhelmed by the "combination of deprivation, disorganization and communal depression," their apathy suggests that on this issue at least, they did not believe that their participation would make a difference, and/or that their community's problems could be solved. Could school reform rally them?

The School

Holiday Elementary School is a three story yellow, brick building. Even though the facility is only forty years old, the building and grounds are already dingy and dilapidated. The roof is flat and this makes it unbearably hot on the third floor late in the academic year. Teachers use an empty lot across the street for parking. An elevated train track, built decades earlier, runs directly around

its perimeter. The noise from the trains is so loud that each fall many of the school's new "babies" (pre-schoolers and kindergartners) fear that the tracks might actually run through their classrooms. Mrs. Lily and Mrs. Able, two teachers who co-chaired the PPAC, said that over time all of the children learn to ignore the noise, just as the teachers have done. But still they question the sense and/or the sensitivity of the decision-makers in "high places" who by their actions demonstrate little concern for the learning environment of black kids in the projects. "Can you imagine building a school next to a train?" Mrs. Able asked us. "I don't think you'd see it in the suburbs."

Because of the dangerous conditions outside, the principal, faculty and a core group of parents work hard to make the school itself a "safe haven" for their almost 650 students when they are inside. In fact, these adults regard safety as the precursor and foundation to anything else that they might try to do for the children. Ms. Lasky, a veteran teacher at Holiday for ten years told us: "Our basic aim is to provide a safe environment that counterbalances the dangerous and often demoralizing aspects of life in this community." In fact, this "safe environment" seems to provide a haven for many of Holiday's parents too. On any given day they can be seen helping out in the building, especially in the pre-school and primary grades. Several of the moms that we talked to told us that their involvement began when they first walked their youngest child to school, and then into the building to ensure that they arrived on time and safe. Many found the professional staff pleasant and the environment a friendly one. Consequently they found ways to volunteer their time and stay in the building with their children as well.

Not only is Holiday safe and inviting, but, for the most part, it seems well-run too. Radner likes to accompany visitors from central office and other agencies when they first tour his building. They expect a "ghetto" school and generally do a "double-take" when they find that this

> little school in the heart of the projects is such an orderly, comfortable and functional place. . .I just love it when people come in here. They're just so shocked and surprised that the school is running well.

The Principal: Last of a Dying Breed

One reason that Holiday runs so well is its principal. Mr. Marvin Radner has been principal since 1981. Prior to that, he spent seven years as an administrator at central office. He left this post when he got frustrated with the "senseless bureaucracy. . .They wanted to give me more work but no more money. . Then, they didn't even let me do my job. I said, `I'm out of here.'"

Radner, who is middle-aged, grew up in the 1940's in a then-flourishing Jewish neighborhood on Chicago's south side. He attended public schools and graduated from the city college system. Mr. Radner told us that given his background, his credentials, and his stint at central office, he might have been considered for the principalship of a magnet school or a specially funded academy. Instead, he told the "powers-that-be"[40] that he wanted a neighborhood school so that he would have the "autonomy and opportunity to make a difference in the lives of kids."

When he was assigned to Holiday he told us that it was "an OK place in terms of how people got along, but there wasn't much that you could point to about its educational program." Radner replaced an older, African American, male principal who had been well-liked. Prior to his retirement, this principal was friendly to children and their families, and did not press the faculty to do much. When Radner came on the scene he felt that his first challenge--in fact, the prerequisite to his accomplishing anything else--was to develop rapport with the community. When we asked him what it was like to be a white, Jewish principal in this community, Radner responded candidly:

> I'll be very honest; I certainly think that I'll be the last one around here. I don't think this community, or many communities that have the same demographics, will accept it or allow it [anymore]. It just happens that I have a certain kind of personality and

> I've worked for years to develop [positive]...school community relations. I look at all the other schools that are in Chicago housing projects, and there aren't too many white male principals left, and everyone that was removed was replaced with a minority..."[41]

Radner went on to say (with a mixture of pride and surprise) that he may have better relationships with his parents than many of his minority colleagues:

> The strange thing, it appears that they're [African American principals] having more difficulty than me, and I can't figure it out. I just think that I really work on my rapport with my community though. I have a good following around here, and it amazes me that most of the time (knock on wood) racial politics don't play a role. . .It's [race] always looming in the back of my mind, though, and I'd be ignorant if I didn't realize it.

Once when there was real potential for overt racial conflict, Radner took what he called a "proactive stance." That was 1992, when the verdict came in on the Rodney King trial and South Central Los Angeles erupted in riots. Across the nation people braced for an anticipated ripple effect in African American communities and schools, and Holiday was no exception. When it became clear that calm would prevail, Radner decided to use the incident as an opportunity to stimulate dialogue within the school about the issues at hand. He said:

> I gave the teachers activities and lessons to discuss and questions to bring out with their children and how to approach it in a non-inflammatory way. . .the LSC applauded that because I took the same stance [against racial injustice] that my council, which is 100% minority, took on that issue. We both coincided very well.

Also important as an explanation to his acceptance and consequent longevity at Holiday is the fact that his community believes that he is committed to them, their children and their children's potential. While he will acknowledge to anyone that the students at Holiday have many "social deficits," Radner stresses that the "kids here can learn, just like the ones at Perkins [an advantaged elementary school on Chicago's Gold Coast]." He wants "his" children to be educated so that they

can successfully compete with "middle class America." Many in the community respect him not only for coming to Holiday in the first place, but for "sticking with them" because he wants to "make a difference in the lives of kids." For most of the community this sincerity overrides any reservations that they might have initially harbored about his race, religion or ethnicity. For example, Benita Hollings volunteers for a CHA sponsored social service program that operates in several schools in the area. She regards Radner as: "the best principal in the city. . He may be a white man, but he sure has our children at heart."

A Family Politics

A disinterested faculty. Radner told us that when he first came to Holiday he was a proponent of participatory governance--at least as far as his faculty was concerned. Almost a decade before the reform law was passed he had actively encouraged his teachers to participate in and even take charge of decisions and innovations related to educational issues as well as broader school governance matters. But the faculty was not interested. The majority locked themselves up each day with their students behind closed classroom doors. Radner complained that this isolation rendered them:

> rather parochial. They get excited about their own specific subject areas but I have a tough time getting them to join me in school-wide planning efforts. That's where I need their brain power.

Radner acknowledged that the passage of reform created many new opportunities for teachers to get involved:

> Since reform, I think there's more opportunity to improve student outcomes now. . .I certainly think that changes that one could never even consider pre-reform with regard to instructional practices and teacher selection can happen now.

Nevertheless, his faculty, for the most part, remained uninspired. Mr. Horn, a fourth grade classroom

teacher, summed it up this way: "Mr. Radner would let us plan the whole curriculum if he thought we would do it. But, most of us like to play in our own backyards." Likewise, Mrs. Jamison, a Holiday teacher for 17 years, suggested that reform captured the attention of a few on the faculty, but did little to motivate the large core to relate differently to their school community:

> Teachers who are on the LSC have been moderately successful in enlisting volunteers for planning committees, some after-school tutorial efforts and the like, but, we need, but are not getting, all of our teachers as pro-active partners in order to confront the barriers that exist out there to discourage student learning.

Not surprisingly in a school where there was so little faculty interest in school-based management, the Professional Personnel Advisory Committee took a long time to get off the ground. This committee was included in the legislation as a new structure for soliciting teachers' input. By law the principal was obligated to convene the first meeting. Radner did so and the faculty elected Mrs. Abel and Mrs. Lasky as co-chairs. But when we interviewed them, neither could tell us about anything specific that the PPAC worked on during their tenure, nor could they nor the principal nor other faculty members point to any significant accomplishments of the committee over the course of five years. When we asked one new teacher about the committee's work and active participants, she said that her socialization to the school did not include any explicit mention of the PPAC: "I'm new here. I came from a school in the suburbs last year and I don't even know exactly what the PPAC is supposed to do."

Radner summed up teachers' involvement this way. He said that the committee as it was legislated was ill-suited to the dynamic of his particular school:

> . . .the PPAC is a cumbersome way to talk with the teachers. [When we need to do something] I just call them into my office or meet in their classrooms and we get things done in more of a family setting.

The family dynamic that Radner describes in relation to his faculty is consistent with Putnam's idea of a vertically organized society where a paternalistic leader makes decisions. It fits closely too with one variant of "consolidated principals' power" identified in Bryk et al.[42]

Trusting relations but a limited role for parents. Many of the parents that we talked to also use family metaphors to characterize routines of daily life and relationships at the school. Moreover, they describe their family as a comfortable one. For example, one parent member of the LSC described Radner, and the council's orientation to its work, like this:

> He's like a big brother that you can really talk to. Once you get to know him, if you ask him something he'll try his best to do it. In return, when he asks us to do something, we do our best to do it.

Such an orientation toward working together seems dependent on a community context where relationships are stable, enduring and positive--much like the pattern that characterizes Radner's relations with his long term, parent volunteers. Most importantly, they seem to be established on a foundation of mutual trust and caring.

Regardless of the school community's comfort with their family politics, the patriarchy that they all describe is greatly at odds with the active governance role for parents advanced by Chicago's reform. In this conception the parent dominated LSC is envisioned as a decision making body, that engages with the professional staff around issues of planning, personnel and budget.[43] It is not that Radner or his staff or parents oppose parental involvement. Rather, Radner thinks, and the majority of his community concur, that parents have no place in school governance. He told us that parents should provide "input rather than involvement because involvement too easily translates into interference."

Consequently, the Holiday family seemed most at ease when they develop structures for

parents to be supportive to the staff. For example, each September Radner and the faculty plan and encourage parents to come to an Open House. To boost attendance, the teachers promise door prizes and an ice cream party for the classroom that boasts the largest parent participation. At the Open House teachers ask parents to sign a pledge for each of their children. It commits the parents to designate a study space in their home, and to make sure that their children attend school every day and arrive on time. Parents also promise to communicate with their children's teachers on a regular basis to insure that things are going smoothly and that homework is completed.

When we asked what percentage of parents signed the pledge and then what number lived up to it, Radner seemed surprised by the question. He told us that he "didn't keep a count." He said that the pledge was "just a good faith effort to get them involved with their child's education."

While the professional staff at Holiday saw this pledge as mainly a symbolic gesture to involve parents as partners in their children's education, they did rely on parents to fulfill other roles that would help them run the school. Again, these were not governance roles. Rather, in a city school where there is always a shortage of clerical and support staff,[44] a core group of young mothers was counted on as classrooms aides, and volunteers in the playground and the lunchroom. Moreover, Radner suggested that parents' presence in these common areas of the school was especially important given his somewhat tenuous position as "a white authority figure in the projects." Not wanting to be the one to exert all of the social control, he relied on these women to "police the place in a `black-on-black' context."

How can we sum up the politics that best characterized the Holiday school community when reform was first passed? It mirrored that of a patriarchal family where a benevolent father--or big brother--was firmly in control at the top. While this orientation seemed acceptable to everyone we

talked to within the school community, it was clearly in conflict with the active decision making role for parents that was advanced by at least some advocates of Chicago's reform.[45] Consequently, we were anxious to find out what would happen when the first LSC was voted in and these two disparate worlds met.

The First LSC

LaDonna Hall described Holiday's first LSC election as ". . . a flurry of campaigning, candidate forums and a big election day turnout." The candidates' forums, required by the new law, were organized by Mr. Radner and some of the teachers. Mrs. Hall's nomination statement was typical of many that encouraged parent involvement and a commitment to the children.[46] She dedicated herself to "be what I've always been, a constant source of information so that we can all help our kids to learn and succeed in this world." Radner and several teachers had urged Hall to run. They also encouraged several other parents, who, like Hall, had been volunteers in the building. They suggested that the parents campaign door-to-door in the projects, and they helped them to prepare flyers and posters. When we asked Mrs. Clambus, one of the active teachers, why the professional staff got involved in these ways, she said: "We've worked hard to build a family atmosphere around here and we knew who best fits and who won't."

In addition to Hall and her fellow volunteers, several other individuals presented themselves as candidates. In fact, there were contested races in each category. Nine candidates ran for the six parent slots, four for the two community representative slots, and four for the two teacher slots. Hall was surprised at the enthusiasm that the LSC elections generated throughout the community. "That particular day, people I hadn't seen around for awhile came out and voted. It was like we were voting

for president [of the United States] or something." Someone else explained that "school reform was something new so, a lot of people just wanted to check it out." Not surprisingly, the six parent and two community members who won the election were familiar faces around the school. Without exception, they were among the candidates that Radner and the faculty had promoted. The parent representatives were all single moms. In addition to Hall, the line-up included Betty Burnett, Luella Campbell, Randi Atkins, Alice Walters, and Coretta Crisan. The two community representatives, Duane Roberts and his mother Grace, had never been classroom volunteers. Rather, the staff had gotten to know them through their involvement over many years with clean-up campaigns and candy sales that the school periodically sponsored. Mr. Polun and Mrs. Majinsky were the two teacher representatives.

Hall as LSC chair: Establishing a pattern of leadership and a focus of work

Radner convened the first meeting of the council, as obligated by the law, and told them that their first responsibility was to elect a parent as chair. Hall nominated herself. She reminded the group that she had been involved with the school for more than ten years, first as a classroom aide, lunchroom volunteer and field trip chaperon. Beginning in 1989 (and at Radner's request) she was also the school's representative to a district-wide parents' committee.[47] She reminded the group that she had received over two hundred votes to top all other parent candidates. The fact that no one else wanted the office made her selection easy.

When we asked Hall retrospectively why she had wanted to be chair, she told us that it was her experience on the district council that made her feel qualified:

> It was all of the meetings that I went to across the city and the things that I learned from being on the district council that made me think about running for president. . .When the election of LSC officers took place, I nominated myself for chairperson.

I said, `I want to be president.' The others said, `No, I don't want that responsibility.'

Mrs. Hall had lived in the projects for twenty-seven years--since she moved to Chicago from Georgia. Her background was similar to almost everyone else on the first counsel:

> When I came up here as a teenager, I started to high school. That's when I had my oldest daughter and quit. Later, I took some General Education Diploma (GED) classes, but I flunked the test...I haven't received much of a formal education but, I really find it easy to meet and talk with people wherever I go.

Hall's volunteerism began when the first of her four children was enrolled. She told us, "When my kids were small, I said, `Well, I'll spend my time being in the schoolhouse with them.'" If she was near her children she could ensure that they were treated well and fed properly. Most importantly, by walking to and from school with her children in-hand, she could guard their passage on routes that necessarily wound in and out of different gang territory.

In spite of her experience on the district council, it only took three meetings before Mrs. Hall realized that her responsibilities as LSC chair went well beyond her skills and competencies. According to Hall the most difficult task that the council tackled the first year was "dealing with the budget." The biggest problem was knowing what budget items were "legitimate from an official standpoint." Hall said that the process proved frustrating. Members directed all their questions to Radner rather than the chair, but this was not the irritating part. What annoyed her was how long the process took. First,

> they [parent and community members] wanted clarifications on exactly which areas we were allowed [by the Board of Education] to spend money. [Then] we had to go item-by-item and members wanted to know, `why do they [the teachers] want to do this? Who really needs this? And what's this for?' We simply did not know. . . But Mr. Radner was always very patient with the council during these meetings. He answered all of our questions.

When we asked Radner what these early meetings had been like from his perspective, he

furrowed his brow and said, "just slow." We asked why he had not used these conversations as occasions to teach his council the skills that they would need to help him develop the budget, as encouraged in the law. He suggested that such teaching "would have been a waste of everyone's time.. . .they are a good group of people but non-functional. They just lack the skills." He was comfortable letting the council depend on him for what he termed "the more technical information."

Radner made it clear that he did not expect any help from the LSC in decisions about educational issues either. When asked about the LSC's role in developing the School Improvement Plan (SIP) he said:

> As you know, the SIP goals drive Holiday's overall program. But for the 1989-1990 school year there was no council guidance in constructing the plan. They did approve it, however. This was because they did not have the skills to contribute substantively. But, the parents, most of whom are around the school on a daily basis, can look at the items that I suggest and know that these items are needed in the school. But they can't make suggestions about the curriculum.

We were curious that during the first year of reform no one on the council asked Radner for training, nor did they ask him about, nor seek out on their own, the videos and printed guides that were available without cost to every public school in the district through groups like Designs for Change, the City-Wide Coalition for School Reform and Leadership for Quality Education. We asked Radner if training from these external sources might have been beneficial. He was exasperated with the question. "I told you before. They're real good people, but they're just not capable of grasping budgeting and planning information."

Whereas Holiday parents were deferent to the principal on budgetary issues and school improvement planning, they were the undisputed experts when it came to kitchens and food preparations. According to Hall, "the food in the lunch room was the first issue that the council

addressed." Since all but a handful of the students qualified for free breakfast and lunch, the parent representatives wanted their children to be served more food, more nutritious food, and more attractively prepared food. Luella Brown and Coretta Crisan took the lead in many of these discussions. They had been cooking since they were small children and so felt qualified to give advice. At one LSC meeting when Radner knew that these issues were on the agenda, he asked the lunchroom manager, Mrs. Elder, to sit in. Mrs. Campbell told Mrs. Elder in great detail how bad the food was, and how she could select and prepare it better. She said: "these kids don't need sweet things for breakfast. They are hyper enough as it is."

Another item that the LSC felt comfortable with was the principal's contract. He was in the first round and so it was up to the council to evaluate his performance and offer him a four year contract or recruit his replacement that spring (1990). According to Hall,

> approving the principal's contract was the easiest thing that we had to do. We all knew that we liked him and wanted to keep him. So, we just went around the room [and voted]. It was unanimous.

Unlike many other councils that followed more extensive and formal procedures,[48] at Holiday the LSC did not even entertain a discussion. They simply took a voice vote.

In the council's second year, vacancies became a problem. For different reasons, three council members resigned before Christmas. The first, Alice Walters, quit in October when she was offered a job as a teachers' aide in a neighboring school.[49] In November, Mrs. Roberts, one of the two community representatives, announced that she had found a part-time job that would prohibit her from attending the monthly, morning LSC meetings. Then, in December, Radner got the chance to hire a new school community representative (SCR).[50] He offered Hall the job and she submitted her resignation immediately.

We were curious about Radner's decision to hire Hall. Clearly he liked her and they worked well together. She was also one of the more experienced parent members on his council. We asked Radner why he would ignore her long history of volunteerism, and his own comfortable relationship with her as LSC chair, and offer her a job that many in his parent group might have needed and been able to fill. We asked too if some might interpret his offer more cynically--perhaps as an attempt to get an experienced person off the council. Radner said that he saw it differently. First of all, he doubted that he would lose Hall as a volunteer. It was more likely that in addition to her duties as a SCR she would continue with her other activities.[51] He said that he did not have ulterior or sinister motives. In fact, he would miss her on the LSC. But whenever he was in a position to help "members of his family," he did so:

> I recognize that the hierarchy of needs places mere survival at the apex of the parents' agenda and limits the amount of time and energy they can devote to strictly voluntary activities such as the LSC. Consequently, when a slot opens up around here, I think of my best people, first. They are the ones who work the most around here, anyway. Plus, they can use the money.

Campbell as LSC chair: Maintaining a pattern

Following Hall's departure, the council elected Luella Campbell as chair. Like her predecessor, Mrs. Campbell had grown up in the projects. In fact, she graduated from Holiday in 1963. She boasted, "Since my name was at the beginning of the alphabet, I was literally one of the very first students to enroll more than thirty years ago."

Also similar to Hall, Campbell was a single mom. She became active in the school when her second child, Melissa, was identified as a "slow learner" and placed in special education classes in second grade. That is when Campbell joined the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Parent Advisory Committee. Subsequently, she was elected chair. Shortly thereafter Radner asked

her to be the school's representative on the district council for special education programs.

Both of these committees were intended to be advisory in nature (the former to the principal and the later to the district office). In fact, they were primarily informational for parents. At most committee meetings, professionals from the Board of Education or some other educational agency made presentations to them. Nevertheless, these committees gave parents like Hall and Campbell a chance to represent the school. Most importantly from Radner's perspective, they brought information back to him about new policies that were sometimes discussed at the district meetings, and/or information about new resources that were available to local schools. Consistent with his view that parents should provide "input rather than involvement," Radner was less concerned that parents develop leadership skills on these committees as he was that they keep him appraised of current events.[52]

Nevertheless, Mrs. Campbell reported that as a result of serving on these various committees, she did learn new skills--such as constructing agendas for meetings, and facilitating group discussions. She thought that these skills would serve her well when she became involved with reform. She said: "My roles as chairperson of the ESEA committee and delegate to the district-wide council gave me the experience that I've used as LSC chair." She asserts, however, that once she became chair her most significant leadership skills were neither managerial or organizational, but interpersonal. Like Hall who found it "easy to meet and talk with people," Mrs. Campbell was able:

> to get people to talk together and to keep the conflict down. When some people on the council had their own ax to grind, I just move right on with the real business.

When we asked her to talk about those aspect of her leadership roles were particularly difficult, she expounded immediately on her aversion to conflict situations--whether it involved demonstrating in

the state capitol to pressure legislators to approve the education budget as she had done as ESEA chair, or her more recent efforts to mediate squabbles among council members: "When they get to bickering over things, it makes it hard for me to understand why. I don't like to be around a lot of stuff like that."

We asked Mrs. Campbell to tell us about some of the important activities of the LSC during her tenure as chair. She said that her main concern was to fill the three remaining vacancies.[53] She reported that everyone agreed on the importance of recruiting persons who were well known to the council, and so unlikely to disturb the comfortable family atmosphere that had been established. In fact, this became their single selection criterion. For example, at a January meeting the first order of new business was to fill the community representative seat vacated by Mrs. Roberts. One parent started off the discussion by saying:

> I think that any new member should be someone we know since the council is working so smoothly now. I wouldn't want anyone to come in and take over and cause problems.

Then the parents talked among themselves about people they knew from the community who might "fit into the family. . .the group." Likewise, the teachers representatives brainstormed about former students who had been "good," and were known to still be living in the area. Mr. Polun said, "What about Hal Billingsley? He is a twenty-two year old, former student and a high school graduate who works with children at the YMCA and volunteers with me in the gym. What do you think?"

Everyone on the council thought Billingsley would be good. So Polun left the meeting, went to the school gym, and returned with him. When Billingsley entered the room, Mrs. Campbell asked him: "Do you know what we are about here?"

Billingsley replied, "I've heard about the LSC, but I'm not sure what it does exactly."

Rather than describing any specific roles and responsibilities, Campbell explained the parameters within which an LSC member should act. She stressed that the council was not "taking over the school or taking the teachers' jobs."

Betty Burnett added that "the council does not want to cause any harm or hurt anybody. Everything we do is to benefit kids." Billingsley agreed on the spot to become a community representative and the council voted unanimously to accept him.

With the community seat now filled, Mrs. Campbell was ready to move onto the two parent vacancies. She told the council that they needed to fill the other two seats so that there would be more parents to share the work of the council. She reminded them that if they did not fill these seats, they would be without a full council until the next LSC elections, scheduled for October. Mrs. Campbell asked the council to suggest some names of people they might recruit.

Radner was the first to respond, but to Campbell's surprise, he had a different agenda in mind. "So, with Hal on the council that makes us two members short instead of three. I suggest that we ride the year out with nine members until June. I'm not overly concerned with getting two new people for a few months." He asked the members if they thought his was a good idea and they did.

Mrs. Campbell looked confused, but she said, "Well, if that's what everyone wants, that's fine with me." The vacancies were not brought up again.

The LSC's next big issue was the October 1991 election, and it was Radner who was most aggressive in strategizing so that the council would preserve its family quality. At both the June meeting just before summer break, and the September meeting at the beginning of the 1991-1992 school year, he initiated considerable discussion about the October elections. In June he said:

You hear about those councils with all those problems. You know what, I'm nervous

> about October. God forbid we get nasty people elected who don't think of kids. Next time they will have everyone vote for everyone. That will be wild.[54]

Likewise, at the September meeting Radner launched into the same territory when he said:

> I'm praying to the above that our three parents get re-elected because they have experience and the others [new candidates] don't know what it is all about, but they can be tempered by those who have experience.

Radner then went into great detail to suggest a voting strategy that he hoped would assure a good council:

> You get five votes and three of you are running again. You should vote for each other. That's three votes. I would vote for myself and you two [pointing to two of the parents]. It's just not you [that you should be concerned about]. You don't want to be sitting with 5 idiots. Who else can you vote for? That leaves 2 votes. Tim Boltz runs the [Neighborhood Youth] Center. He would be good. That leaves one more. You all better make it a good one.

No one on the council questioned the principal's suggestions. Obviously, they agreed with his desire to have a council composed of people they knew.

Comments about Holiday's First Council

Holiday's first council is striking for a number of reasons. The parent members are all single mothers, well known by the professionals, and fully in accord with the staff's desire to keep conflict out of the school, and maintain a peaceable family atmosphere inside the building. Their image of a good school is a safe, functional one, where parents provide "input rather than interference." In essence, the image is of a family--with an older man at the helm.

This family image is consistent with both Putnam's portrait of a vertically controlled society, and also the pattern of school community politics identified as consolidated principal's power in Bryk et al's. report. It is important to note that neither Putnam nor Bryk regard this organization as necessarily negative. Putnam suggests that in medieval times the arrival of a strong authoritarian

figure who imposes limits and control might have been a significant improvement over the anarchy that preceded it. Similarly, Bryk et al. identify a pre-reform pattern whereby strong principals were sometimes assigned by the central office to bring order to a school that was "out of control." Such principals--if they were, in fact, able to restore the peace--were often regarded by their local communities as heroes.

Interestingly, Holiday's history does not quite fit this pattern. It was, by all accounts, a quiet school before Radner got there, and it still is. In this community participants' aversion to conflict seems to stem not so much from an organizational memory of chaos, but from their desire to maintain within the school building a calm environment that stands in contrast to the violent, gang-ridden and senseless world outside. Thus Radner is a hero, but, even here, there is a twist. As a white man in the projects Radner cannot "police the place" on his own. Rather, he works with his family--the faculty and a core of parent volunteers--to maintain a peaceable school. While such a politics is greatly at odds with the notion of parent empowerment embodied in Chicago's reform, in a community like Holiday's, we were not aware of any detractors.

It is also interesting that the first two LSC chairs, Mrs. Hall and Mrs. Campbell, followed similar leadership trajectories; first as school volunteers, next as participants and then the chair of parent advisory school committees, and finally as the school's parent representative on a district committee. Moreover, both women ascended to their district-level involvement at Radner's suggestion. His primary concern in these promotions was not to develop these individuals as leaders, but rather to have people that he could trust representing the school and bringing information back to him. In fact, Radner got a bit irritated with our line of questioning that sought to explore his feelings on leadership development, saying to us sharply at one point, "I told you before. . .they just

lack the skills."

We note that Radner's *modus operandi* might be viewed negatively from the perspective of some Chicago reform advocates. Their aim was to create opportunity for parents to become involved in school decision-making, much like the community organizers cited earlier who hoped that LSCs might become a training ground for the development of indigenous leadership. But from the perspective of the Holiday family, Radner motives and methods seemed to be above suspicion.

Finally, to better understand the school community's orientation to leadership development, we turn to the perspective of the LSC chairs themselves. Prior to their election as chair, both Mrs. Hall and Mrs. Campbell felt that it was their experience on the various school and district committees, and the organizational skills that they learned, that qualified them to be nominated. Their early analysis of their own leadership development is consistent with the views of the community organizers who anticipated that the LSC, like the earlier district committees, might provide forums where individuals could practice citizenship and learn democratic skills. Surprisingly, however, once they gain some experience as chair, both Hall and Campbell determine that their familiarity with agendas and minutes were of minor value. Much more significant were their personalities. Thus, Hall cited her ability to "meet people and talk with them," and Campbell talked to us about her capacity to "keep the conflict down." Neither woman suggested that they had learned these skills as a result of their LSC experience--or even that such skills could be learned. Rather, they maintained that these were an inherent part of their personalities and well-suited to the family orientation that everyone wanted to prevail at Holiday. Thus their comments were reminiscent of their principal, who worked continually on "his rapport with the school community," and says that it accounted for his success and longevity. Like him, they emphasized the role of their interpersonal skills and downplayed

leadership development in the school.

The Second LSC

Tim Boltz as LSC chair: Breaking new ground

In October 1991 the second LSC elections were held city-wide. Much to Radner's consternation, Holiday's election was contested. Fourteen people ran for the ten seats, and only four of these--two parents, one teacher and one community representative--were holdovers from the first council. We asked Mrs. Campbell why so few members had run for re-election. She surmised, "there wasn't nearly the same type of campaigning and announcements around the community as there had been for the first election." Another parent said that she had too many other things to do, while a third confessed that she was bored with the council meetings. "All we do is listen to reports," she complained. She could not say what might have sustained her interest, however.

Of the six new people who came onto the council, three were young single mothers--all volunteers at the school. The biggest vote-getter was Mrs. Green. She got more than one hundred votes. Diane Hathaway replaced Polun as the new teacher representative, and Erik Corn, an aide to the local alderman, replaced Duane Roberts as community representative. Most interesting was the election of Tim Boltz, the first man ever to be elected as a parent representative on the LSC.

We asked Boltz what accounted for his victory. He acknowledged that Radner had endorsed him. He also told us about some campaigning that he had organized on his own. He had asked many of the children who attended his neighborhood center to champion his campaign. Prior to the election:

I gave [the students] fliers and said, `you take this home and tell your mother, Mr.

> Boltz is running for Local School council, so vote for him.' And, when a parent would ask, `Who is Mr. Boltz?' The kids would tell them: `He's a good man, vote for him.' So a lot of parents voted for me on their children's opinion of who I was.

Parents may also have been inclined to vote for Boltz because his youth center, like the school, was regarded a safe zone.

Mrs. Campbell called the first organizational meeting of the new council and made a surprise announcement. Radner had offered her a job as a bus aide just before the election. She had neglected to withdraw her candidacy, somehow, but as an employee of the Board she was now ineligible to serve. Thus the new LSC faced its first two challenges--filling the vacancy that Mrs. Campbell created and electing a new chair.

No one seemed more dazed by this turn of events than Radner, even though he had, in fact, created the problem. While there were familiar faces in the other women, none had worked with him as much as Campbell and Hall. Radner told us that he had not expected so few members of "his LSC family" to return to the council when he offered Campbell the job. But he again defended his hiring practices by saying:

> Most of the people around this school need money. So, when I have an opportunity to find them a job, I do. Anyway, who would you rather have working for you, someone who knows the kids or a stranger?

In a later conversation, however, Radner confessed that, "By hiring Campbell, I certainly created a vacuum in leadership."

Tim Boltz was elected chair. He said:

> When the nominations were being made [for chair], one person said, `I nominate [Mr. Boltz].' I said, `Wait, a minute. I just started doing this...give me some experience first.' But then I agreed to run and was elected.

Boltz clearly did not fit the Holiday pattern for LSC chair. Not only was he male, he was in

his late thirties, and married to a homemaker named Heather.[55] Both Tim and Heather had grown up in the projects, and graduated from Holiday. But then he had left the neighborhood, attended college, and entered graduate school. He and Heather had recently bought a small house in a neighboring attendance area and elected to send their child to Holiday.[56] None of the other parent representatives had made it out of the south side--much less found their way back. Also, during his time away Boltz had gained significant leadership experience through his studies and various job-related supervisory positions. Another break with tradition was the fact that neither Boltz nor his wife had ever volunteered. He had only visited the school occasionally to talk with students and teachers about his center's youth programs. In this tight-knit family, Boltz was a definite "outsider."

Nor was Boltz comfortable with the relaxed family atmosphere that had become the hallmark of the Holiday council. For instance, he was incredulous when he learned that the first LSC had never been trained. He told his group in no uncertain terms that they "must" be trained. Toward that end he started to bring flyers of citywide training sessions to LSC meetings, and he encouraged council members to go with him. But no one did. Undaunted, Boltz arranged for representatives of a citywide advocacy group to present their program at an LSC meeting. The representatives described the workshops that they conducted on volunteer recruitment, group decision-making, budget and curriculum. Holiday's council listened politely, asked one question about the organization's fees (it was free), and never discussed them again.

Still, Boltz persisted. He attended training sessions on his own, read the law, and made it his business to remind the LSC that as elected officials they had certain obligations to meet. He was impatient when Erik Corn, the new community representative, missed three meetings in a row. Boltz told the council that according to the legislation, it was within their jurisdiction to notify Corn by

certified letter that he had been removed from the council for non-attendance, and then replace him. But the other members were uncomfortable with this idea. They said Corn might have wanted to come to the meetings, but just been too busy. Boltz told them that he was not trying to get Corn off the council. Rather, he wanted everyone to take their role seriously, so that the council could become a "real, decision-making body." So they compromised and Boltz wrote Corn a letter reminding him of his responsibility to attend monthly meetings. At the following meeting, Corn showed up and made a public apology to the council. He said that he had missed the meetings because of his job, but acknowledged that "this was no excuse." He promised to attend all subsequent meetings (and did).

Boltz was also critical of the council's evaluation of the principal the previous year. He said it was too "casual" and made it clear that under his leadership, the process for annual review would be different. He brought up training again. He reminded the council that principal evaluation was their single most important responsibility, and so they had to be trained by one of the citywide groups or the Board. Boltz offered to arrange transportation for anyone who needed it. Later he expressed "great disappointment" that no one went with him to any of the training sessions. He was even more irritated when no one was willing to participate on an evaluation committee, and so he had to conduct and write the principal's evaluation himself.[57]

Spring was also the time to update the SIP and write a budget for the following year. Boltz was again shocked to find that the previous council had not contributed to the development of the SIP. Even more egregious, from his point of view, they had neglected to write a vision statement that would guide their planning. He asked each council member to write a brief paragraph outlining what they wanted the statement to include. Boltz told them:

> We need to get all of your ideas about what the school should be. Not what it isn't, but we would like to come back and share among us what we would like to see. . .Then we can plan strategies and activities geared toward this.

At the start of the next meeting Boltz and one of the teacher representatives presented their paragraphs. Corn, indicated that he "had intended to do one but never found the time." Hathaway offered a similar excuse. Several months elapsed. Boltz asked each parent repeatedly when he could expect their statements. In a meeting Hathaway eventually said something to the effect that he "just kept forgetting to do it," and everyone else nodded in agreement. Eventually Boltz told us that he realized that the problem was not forgetfulness. Rather, the parent members could not do the "assignment" because they were "uncomfortable writing things for others to read." The vision statement was never discussed again.

While Boltz' attempts to "jump start" the council were slow to ignite much response from them, he did spur Holiday's professionals into action. For example, a few months into Boltz' tenure, we noticed that Radner acted differently at council meetings. He was no longer the father figure (or de facto chair) who answered all of the members' questions and responded to their concerns. Instead, he began to function as an information conduit. Radner, like Boltz, showered the council with flyers about training opportunities. Radner's bulletins were not like the ones that Boltz brought in, however. While Boltz' focused on the legislation and representatives' responsibilities under the law, Radner's announced opportunities for parent to be trained on topics such as "How to Start Parent Volunteer Committees at Your School," "Involving Parents in their Children's Education," "How to Organize a Spring Social" and "Do You Want to Be a School Aide?"

The faculty supported Radner's efforts to direct parent participation away from governance and toward volunteerism. At one LSC meeting, for example, Mrs. Branch, the new PPAC chair,

introduced herself and described her committee's plans for the year. She said that the PPAC was in the first stages of planning events to attract more parents to the school. Boltz interrupted her. "I'd like for you to involve some of the parents who are here," he said. "I haven't been to one of your meetings but a lot of that is because I don't hear about it until the day of the meeting."

Branch was upset by his tone. "I don't think you have to talk to me like that," she said. "Everything we do parents are welcome to participate. . These are their children. Maybe the issue is communication. . ."

"You got that right!" Boltz shot back. "Maybe the issue is communication because I don't know what you are doing. I came to you before and asked for minutes from your meetings because I wanted to know what the PPAC was doing."

"We give minutes only to those PPAC members who are absent from the meeting. The two teachers on this council are PPAC members. Don't you find out what is going on from them?" Hathaway asked Boltz.

"No I don't," he replied. In the end, Branch reluctantly invited Boltz to attend PPAC meetings. Apparently, she did this even though it was within her legal right to limit attendance at PPAC meetings to faculty only.

Boltz was not opposed to the forms of parent involvement suggested by Holiday's professionals. Rather, he refused to buy into the limited assessment that parents are "good people. . .they just lack the skills." Consistent with the reform law, Boltz' thrust was to involve parents in decision-making about school goals, plans, personnel and budget. Moreover, he aimed for this participation to extend beyond the council. At one meeting, for example, Boltz asked the LSC members to consider holding special assemblies to "float some of the questions about how the school

could function better--not that we aren't doing a good job, but, perhaps some improvements would be in line."

Corn picked up on this idea and suggested that they formalize community input by establishing a parent council (additional to the LSC) at the school. Corn said, "It could help us think as well as help us get things done." He suggested a blend of decision-making and volunteer activities to involve parents who were not on the LSC.

Neither Radner nor the teacher representatives took issue with the direction that Boltz and Corn were going. They did not have to, because Mrs. Green, a parent member, took it upon herself to shatter the positive flow of the discussion. She said that in their community such activity would be useless: "It won't work. They won't come. They say that they are coming but they don't." Hathaway reminded Green of parents' attendance at workshops in the past where a stipend had been paid. Green flashed back, ". . .those parents came for the money. Have you seen them since? They won't come." In a subsequent interview, Green admitted to feeling sour grapes when she reflected on her own unsuccessful efforts to recruit parents for various activities during her eleven years as a volunteer. According to her "drug addiction" and "laziness" were the two main impediments to getting the parents involved. She also told us that Boltz was not a good chair for Holiday. She said he was needlessly aggressive and confrontive, and that his behavior "turned people off."

Boltz was not the least upset by the different opinions regarding parent participation, nor the fact that Mrs. Green agreed with the professionals, rather than with him. In fact, Boltz said he "loved passion. . . debate. . .thrived on it. . . especially conversations where parents felt empowered to speak their minds." We told Boltz that some in his community expressed discomfort with his leadership style. He chuckled and said that he was not surprised. He considered these lively exchanges "healthy

dialogue." When we asked specifically about his impressions of this meeting and other conflictual conversations that the council had gotten into since he became chair, Boltz replied:

> In the beginning, it was very slow. It was very hard to get the council members involved and to speak their minds without thinking they were going to be criticized for it. But, now they are interacting and throwing out ideas and saying, `Yeah, I think this would be good, and that would be good.'

In fact, Boltz told us that it was his challenges to the principal that sparked the most heat. The most explosive episode took place that same spring when Radner presented his proposed budget to the Council. As noted before, the budget was not Radner's favorite topic to discuss with the LSC. In previous years the meetings had been tedious because the council persisted in asking him endless questions, in spite of his perception that they were unable to "grasp the more technical information." Curiously, when Boltz became chair, Radner changed his approach. For the first time copies of the budget were distributed in advance to each LSC member. Also new was the overhead projector that Radner used to help the council follow along as he explained the proposed allocations. Furthermore, Radner included far more detail in this budget than he had before. For example, previously he had allocated a lump sum for general school supplies. In 1993, however, he divided school supplies into several categories, with detail about expenditures in each.

Radner opened the discussion with the overhead on and a pointer in hand. He explained:

> The applied amount for [Holiday] School is $3,337,566. There is an unapplied amount of almost one million which is money to be spent, that [has] to be decided on. This money comes from different places--CANAL, State Chapter One, and Federal Chapter One.[58]

A lively discussion ensued. Each participant wanted to know if there was enough money for their favorite programs and projects. Hathaway, who was a pre-kindergarten teacher asked: "What about pre-K, could we use Weekly Readers' and journal books, too?"

Radner responded, "Yes, we can include you in that."

Then Smith, a parent representative, asked, "We'll have a speech therapist? My baby goes to the hospital for speech therapy. Can she come here now?" Radner told her that they could talk to the counselor about that.

Corn asked: "Can a percentage of the book money go to books on black culture and black history?"

"Yes," Radner replied. "Books on black history are covered here on another page." The meeting seemed to be going smoothly in that Radner promised to satisfy everyone's request.

Then Boltz broke protocol. Rather than asking a question he challenged: "I think $6,000 is too much for portfolios."

Before Radner could say a word, Hathaway leaped to her principal's defense: "No, I disagree. I think the portfolios idea is a good one. That way, teachers can see what the kids have done in their classroom since the beginning of the year."

Radner picked up where Hathaway left off. His face was getting red when he said: "CANAL thought it [portfolios] is a good idea too, because it's an alternative form of assessment. $6,000 is a lot of money, but we need something strong and sturdy to hold the students' work in. It's just the initial investment and then we don't have to buy them any more. "

At this point Boltz gave in. "Ok," he said flatly. "I guess that's justified then." Radner turned even redder, and he rubbed his face in relief.

But that relief was short lived. A few minutes later Boltz took issue with the dollar amount that was proposed for student incentives. Boltz said, "I don't think $1,000 is enough money for almost 600 students."

Radner's face got red again. He pressed Boltz to suggest an alternative amount, and to his chagrin, Boltz had a dollar amount in mind, as well as ideas for finding and spending the money. Boltz said: "$2,000 needs to be allotted. . . the additional $1,000 could be taken from the furniture category. . . the student incentives should include T-shirts, added field trips, trips to McDonald's...things that aren't old hat like a paper certificate."

Boltz's comments set everyone off. Mrs. Hampton, a parent representative, expressed her disdain: "We should teach kids that incentives come from within, not from prizes or anything else, or from the school."

Mrs. Green added, "We can't pay students for doing well. That's life. They're not going to get a trip to McDonald's every time they do something well when they grow up."

Boltz countered them both by saying, "That's true, but don't your employers sort of bribe you? When you have perfect attendance, you get an extra day off work or something like that? Do you get some type of award or something when you're doing good for that particular year?" Perhaps Boltz' analogy would have been compelling except for the fact that he was the only employed parent on the council.

The budget discussion ended abruptly at this point. The other parents seemed hurt by Boltz' remark. No one made eye contact with him. They just stared down at the table, and it was unclear if he even realized his *faux pas*. Mrs. Green moved to break the dangerous silence and restore calm to her family. She suggested that a committee be charged with designing an incentive program and presenting it to the LSC for comment and review before any money would be budgeted for it. Hathaway, seized on this suggestion as an opportunity to finally end the meeting. "Good," she said immediately. "Let's do that. . .and for now we should just leave it [the budget] the way that he [Mr.

Radner] proposed it.

Boltz knew he was beat. "Fine. We should take a motion then to pass the budget." It passed unanimously.

At a monthly meeting shortly after the budget was passed the principal informed the LSC that they were supposed to hold officer elections and vote for a new LSC chair. The membership seemed surprised by this announcement. Mrs. Green said that she thought that Boltz had been elected chair for the two year term of the council, or at least for the full academic year. No one, however challenged or even questioned Radner's pronouncement, including Boltz.[59] Instead they took nominations then and there for a new LSC chair. Mrs. Green nominated herself and was elected. Boltz abstained from voting. He continued to attend LSC meetings thereafter, but generally arrived late, and rarely spoke unless asked a direct question. He remained on the council, in this relatively inactive role, until his child graduated at the end of the school year.

Comments about the second LSC

Boltz was surprised by his dismissal. Privately, he confided: "[the principal] surely didn't support me. I think he's glad I'm gone [as LSC chair]."

Boltz also told us that he did not think that it was "legal" for the principal to call for new elections in the middle of his term. He had decided--on the spot--not to fight it, however, because once he lost the budget vote, he knew he was defeated. The budget debate drove home to him the fact that he did not have the council's trust, and without it, he would never be able to get anything done.[60] While Boltz understood all of this at an intellectual level, he was, nevertheless, deeply disappointed. He thought that he was fighting for the betterment of the school--the common good. Moreover, by trying to engage the council in training, discussion and decision-making, he sought to

develop the capacity of individual members as well. Boltz was well aware that the majority of the LSC was uncomfortable with his abrasive leadership style, but he insisted that the ends that he fought for justified the means. Regarding his lack of support among parents he told us that:

> the difficult part of chairing a Local School Council for me was just trying to get people to see and to trust that I'm for the betterment of the school. Because people have been so vulnerable and they've been hurt so much, it's hard for them to keep on trusting.

In contrast to Boltz' feelings of sadness, once the rest of the council got over their surprise that he was removed, they appeared relieved. They appreciated his quiet demeanor the rest of the year as well. Several LSC members characterized the budget debate to us as an attempt by Boltz to challenge Radner's budget. Even more importantly, they perceived it as a threat to disrupt "the family." That was not allowed. In interviews we asked Mrs. Green to help us understand the difference between their questions to Radner about the budget, and Boltz' comments. She suggested that "his tone was mean. . .he argued. . .he acted like he knew it all. . .like he knew all about us and the school and that put people off." In contrast, Mrs. Green said that her's and everyone else's tone was "nicer. . .just asking questions and getting information. . .not arguing or demanding."

The tense dynamics between Boltz and the LSC, and Boltz and the principal, raise important questions about perceptions of "outsiders" and "insiders" in communities like Holiday's. When Boltz was first voted onto the council and elected chair, we were surprised because he did not fit the norm. Once elected, however, we thought that he might be viewed as a role model by his peers since he was an educated, employed, black man, who had returned to the neighborhood to serve it. Instead, his experiences separated him from the other parents on the council, exacerbated their differences and expanded the psychological distance between them. Boltz was always an "outsider." We learned that

in this community caring--as evidenced by long term commitment--was more important that any other attribute. Consequently, it made sense that Radner, a white, middle-aged Jewish man who commuted from an affluent suburb, was the man who parents trusted.

Once Boltz left the chairmanship, the content of the LSC's discussions changed. Debate about the budget ended. In fact, there was no mention of the budget or SIP again--except when Radner annually presented each to the council and routinely got their approval. Nevertheless, we shall see that Boltz did have a lasting, albeit subtle, effect on council dynamics.

The Third Council

The third council was elected in October 1993. Two new members were added--Anthony Trall replaced Hathaway, and Lucy Flowers won the seat vacated by Boltz. Donna Green was unanimously re-elected chair.

Mrs. Green was the mother of three Holiday students. She, like her predecessors, Hall and Campbell, was a female head of household and volunteer at the school. Unlike them, however, Green had no previous committee experience that would have prepared her for a leadership role on the LSC. A graduate of Holiday, she had dropped out of high school the summer before her junior year and moved to Texas where her mother lived. Several years later, she returned to Chicago, attended evening classes and obtained her GED.

Green was proud of her GED and volunteerism at the school. She says that these set her apart from her neighbors in the projects who "deal with drugs. . .Because of these drugs, most people are gone [non functional]," she laments. When we asked how she managed to avoid getting involved she responded:

> People thought I'd be gone too. But I had people in my corner supporting me. The kids' father really helped. I'm not with him anymore, but he told me what to avoid and what was cool and all.

Green enrolled her children in a local day care center when they were pre-schoolers. She volunteered there, and then followed them to Holiday when the first entered kindergarten. Green did not run for the first LSC, because she "just wasn't interested. . ." As noted previously, however, when she ran in 1991 she received more votes than any other parent on the ballot.

Mrs. Green told us that she and Mr. Radner are "tight." They agree that the most appropriate roles for parents are to help their children do their homework, to function as classroom aides, and to help with "crowd control" in the common areas of the school. Green believes that parents and professionals should be partners: "The parent has to make the child work too. The parent and teacher must work together if the children are to learn." On any given day Mrs. Green can be seen about the school delivering materials to classroom teachers, running errands for the front office, or leading children to the lunchroom. Green, like other members of the Holiday family, says that her respect for Radner develops from his commitment to the students and their families.

> He's a really 'down' [to earth] person. He really cares about the kids' learning. He will even sit and read with the children. And, he always treats the parents real good too.

Green as LSC chair: Leading a more sophisticated family

What was the council like with Mrs. Green at the helm? As noted earlier, immediately upon election (and Boltz' ouster), the tone of LSC meetings changed. The council returned to its relaxed, family atmosphere. Interestingly, food, which had not been a feature of LSC meetings in the past, was a part of the new ambiance. Either a parent would bring in homemade coffee cake or cookies, or Radner would treat the council and call for delivery of pizza and pop. There was also considerably

more chatting and joking before meetings were called to order than had been customary when Boltz was chair.

Taking control of the lunchroom. The focus of conversation changed as well. The sharp debates over the budget ended, and dialogue shifted back to the concerns that dominated the first council--lunch room operations, safety and security. This council was much more aggressive and insistent, however, in its attempts to improve both. Sympathetic to their concerns, and frustrated himself with the same issues, Radner suggested to the council that Mrs. Elder, the lunchroom manager, and Mr. Davis, the head security guard, be available to report to the LSC directly. He told us privately that this was a strategy on his part since neither of these employees was under his supervision. He was not about to take the heat for problems and personnel over which he had no control.[61] "When they start griping, I'm just going to send for whomever they are angry with and let them confront the people directly."

The third council, like the first, was critical of the quantity and quality of the food in the lunchroom, and the service. With regard to quantity, parents' were concerned that portions were too small. As noted earlier, almost all of the students were entitled to free breakfast and lunch, and many in fact depended on these meals for their daily sustenance. At one of the first meetings in 1993 when "lunchroom problems" came up as an agenda item, Radner sent a messenger to get Mrs. Elder. She came with a folder in hand. Before Green could even confront her, Elder mounted her defense:

> I've heard that some people have problems with the portions that we are serving, but, you should know. . . there is not a whole lot we can do about that. . .I have to do what the Board tells me to do.

To prove her point, she opened her folder and passed out copies of a central office memo titled "Breakfast Portions for Elementary Students." It stipulated that for the morning meal each child was

to be served "1 portion of meat or cereal, 1 piece of bread, ½ cup of fruit and ½ cup of juice." The council members were shocked. They thought that Chicago reform and local control meant that they could determine how much breakfast their children needed and could be served. Mrs. Green listened as Elder read the memo. She shook her head and said, "We're sorry. We had no idea."

But the council's sympathy for Mrs. Elder was short lived. Mrs. Flowers wanted to know why the food sometimes ran out before the older children got to eat. She charged that "the lunchroom staff doesn't prepare enough food and when something is served that the kids like, it's all gone by the time that the 7th and 8th graders get to eat. Then these upper graders have to settle for cold cuts. That's not fair."

Again, Elder was prepared. She acknowledged the problem and laid the blame squarely on other shoulders. "I couldn't agree with you more," she said. "A major part of the problem is that we don't get an accurate count of the number of children planning to purchase lunches each day."

Radner took exception with this. He asked Elder for clarification. "You mean that you aren't getting a head count? You mean if we had each teacher bring an envelope with the number of children in attendance and expected to eat each day that would end the problem?"

"It certainly would," Elder replied.

"I'll take care of that," Radner said abruptly. He looked irritated and made a note to himself on the margin of his agenda.

Needless to say, at the next monthly meeting and under "Old Business" Mrs. Flowers reported that her son, whom was in seventh grade, had not gotten french fries one day and pizza another because the lunchroom had run out. She accused Radner of neglecting to tell his teachers to get Elder an accurate pupil count. Radner insisted that he had done so, and to the best of his knowledge,

teachers were complying. (The two teacher representatives nodded in agreement.) Radner summoned Elder and turned the questioning to her. "Haven't you gotten a daily head count?" he demanded.

"I have," Elder responded. "But that's not the problem anymore. The problem is the cook. . . She has a mind of her own." Elder then explained to the incredulous council that even though she was the lunchroom manager, the cook belonged to a different union and was not under her direct supervision.

Radner was outraged. He said, "Enough is enough. This is ridiculous. . .Mrs. Elder, I don't care what union she belongs to. Either you find a way to remove the cook or, believe me, I will. . I'll call the district office every day if I have to until they're so sick of me they'll fix this situation!"

The council offered to back him in anyway they could. Mrs. Green said, "just let us know what we can do to help you. . .We'll all go down there or whatever. . ."

Then, the council shifted its focus to the issue of quality. Mrs. Green said to Mrs. Flowers: "Well, at least your child likes some of the food. My children come home hungry and when I ask them, `Didn't you eat in school?' they tell me that most days the food is just plain nasty. The kids want a new menu and food that they can eat. They can't stand those turkey burgers."

Radner jumped to his feet. Before Elder could get a word out he thundered, "Tell whomever is responsible for ordering the food, city-wide, that there will be no more turkey burgers at this school. Period. End of discussion."

But the conversation did not end. It shifted to the quality of service in the lunchroom. Again, Mrs. Green spoke up: "What about the people serving the food to the children? Certainly we don't need a union to tell those people how to behave in our building. They are rude. Sometimes they just

throw the food at the kids, like they're dogs."

Another parent added, "I don't treat my child like that at home and I certainly don't want him treated like that here." Mrs. Elder agreed that the children needed to be treated with respect. She promised to look into the problem and to monitor the situation and report back to the council on her efforts to solve it.

Insisting on security. The third council was also concerned with building security. Theft was one problem. Computers had been stolen from classrooms on two separate occasions in recent weeks. Radner informed the council of this in his monthly report, and, as was his custom now, he had Mr. Davis, the engineer, waiting in the wings to answer to them. As soon as Davis was summoned he apologized to the council about the thefts. He said:

> We're trying to solve this problem. The good news is that the locks on the back door are finally fixed and the security windows and door systems have been installed. This should help the theft problem.

The council was not satisfied. They chastised Davis and told him that he should have noticed the need for locks and security windows before the thefts had occurred.

Mrs. Green told Davis not to leave the meeting as yet, but to sit down. She then reported to the council that she and other members of the council were worried because "strange people" had been observed wandering in and out of the building on more than one occasion, during the school day. Although she noted that there were no reported incidents as yet, the potential for personal attacks from strangers in the school was alarming. Mrs. Green was fearful for her children and herself since she spent so much time as a volunteer in the building. She said she was worried about "the whole Holiday family." The members nodded their heads as they listened to her. One parent member asked, "Have you heard about the little girl that was raped in a school basement across town?"

Another added, "with unauthorized people walking around, particularly in and out of the bathrooms, and with that halfway house right across the street, you never know what could happen here. So far, we have been lucky."

Mrs. Green asked Radner if he could hire another security guard. Radner said that there were no funds for a second guard in the current budget, as he had not foreseen the need for one when he had prepared the budget. Radner went on to say that he was aware of the problem and had already asked central office if he could draw down emergency funds to hire more security. But he had been told that his "situation," while a problem, was not an emergency. Upon hearing this, the council decided to establish a parent patrol to assist Davis. They each signed up to volunteer for specific times during the week. Radner offered to find money for them to have T-shirts made that would identify them as members of the "Holiday Parent Patrol." Just prior to the start of the volunteer patrol, however, Radner somehow managed to hire a second security guard. But that did not end the school's security problems.

The last LSC meeting of 1993 was scheduled on a hot day in June. A rumor had gone around the school that the meeting was going to be canceled because of the heat, and so none of the school staff expected to be called in. Prior to the scheduled start time, we asked Radner if the meeting was going to take place, and he said that it was too late to cancel and re-schedule it. He also warned us that it was going to be "a gripe session." Parents had been voicing their dissatisfaction to him about the security people (Davis and Jerry, the new guard) throughout the week.

The meeting was called to order and Mrs. Hampton read the minutes. There were no corrections or additions. Then she skipped the agenda and directed her comments to Radner. "I'm tired of asking about this, but what exactly are the security guards doing?" In a manner not frequently

seen in Holiday meetings, she went on to scold him. "You have no excuse now, we have two security guards and they still aren't working." The other council members nodded in agreement.

Radner acknowledged that security was still an issue. He summoned Davis, who was not at all happy to hear that the council wanted to see him on such a hot day. Mrs. Green confronted him before he even had a chance to sit down. "Why do you let people just come in and out of the building at will?" she demanded. Before he could answer, she added, "I thought after we got two of you, the whole building would be under constant watch."

Davis appeared stunned by the direct attack. He was apologetic and docile as the other women glared at him. "We are doing the best that we can," he responded. "But, I'll get with Jerry and figure out a better plan for patrolling each of the floors."[62]

Once again, by bringing Davis in, Radner redirected the wrath of his council away from himself. Much more subtly, he told us that he wanted to avoid a situation where he would have to reprimand Davis, a black man, in front of an all-black LSC. Instead, Radner sat back and let the women on his council take care of that. Similar to the meetings where lunchroom problems were discussed, Radner created a scenario that enabled him to side with his parents and against members of his staff who were not under his supervision. Consequently, he avoided acting as the "bad white cop in the projects." Instead, he maintained his identity as "dad" or perhaps the "big brother" who wanted to protect the family's critical interests. What could be more important than the safety of their children?

Comments about Holiday's third LSC

The LSCs' on-going controversies about food preparations, service and security may seem trivial to school reformers who anticipated that parents would debate issues of educational planning,

curriculum and budgeting at each local site. While some of these topics had been deliberated during Boltz' chairmanship, most of the parent representatives had never been comfortable discussing them, much less contributing to decisions that might affect professionals' work. Thus, as noted earlier, as soon as Boltz left the council, it returned to more familiar territory.

It would be mistaken to suggest, however, that in this school community issues of safety, security and meals were less consequential than budget and strategic planning. Rather, the parent representatives were struggling to ensure that their children were properly fed and treated. Moreover, there is evidence that Holiday was not alone in its deliberations during these early years of reform. Bryk et al. report a pattern of the early implementation of reform in similar schools that serve poor children and are situated in racially isolated, dangerous communities. In such places members of the LSC report their need to deal with kinds of fundamental "environmental" problems, before concerns about the educational program and school improvement can even be considered.[63]

It would also be mistaken to infer that the parent and community members of the council were not learning a great deal as a result of these negotiations that would affect their ability to function as parent leaders. In 1993 they were, for the first time, challenging the professionals who worked at their school. Moreover, they were getting a lesson about the limits of local control in Chicago. While they initially labored under the impression that they had been elected to be decision-makers, they were learning that their power was circumscribed. With regard to security, it was not up to the LSC to determine a state of emergency. Rather, it was the central office that had this power. Finally, the third council was learning (with some help from their principal) how to define the enemy. It was not Elder (who as lunchroom manager seemed the obvious first target), or Radner (for failing to have his staff provide accurate pupil counts). Rather the enemy was "bloated bureaucrats" at the central office

(for determining how much their children should eat),[64] and a distant union (which failed to supervise the cook).

Concluding comments

We studied the early implementation of reform in the Holiday school community to investigate several issues. The early functioning of the LSC in a specific, racially isolated, low income, school community; the resources and capacities of the school community at the start of reform; the politics stimulated by the legislation; the adequacy of the five year time frame mandated by the legislation; and whether the creation of an LSC had spill-over effects that stimulated the kinds of citizen participation, community revitalization and leadership development envisioned by veteran community organizers in Chicago. As the case unfolded we note that one additional issue presented itself. The principal's role was more complex that we had originally envisioned, and also key to understanding much of the political development that occurred.

Politics and the Early Functioning of the LSC

At the start of reform, the politics at Holiday fit Putnam's image of a vertically controlled politics, as well as Bryk et al's. pattern of a paternalistic, consolidated principal's power. This was a family where members were respectful and friendly and their interactions were conflict free. The principal, and a core of the faculty and single mothers took care of each other, and the school community. To residents of this community the school represented a safe haven from the world outside. The principal and his core group were credited with maintaining that calm.

The initial passage of PA 85-1418 did little to change this family dynamic. Indeed most of the early obligations of the law were met; for example, an LSC was elected, the principal was offered

a four year contract, and an SIP and budget were developed and passed. These activities, however, were all *pro forma* because they did little to change relations of power in the school community. Here we point to the fact that all of the parent and community members of the first LSC were longtime volunteers at the school, the council was never trained, the first and second chairs were the principal's confidants, the principal operated as a de facto chair, and he alone wrote the school's first SIP and budget. While the first council met its legal obligations, power and authority still resided fully in the principalship.

The coming of Tim Boltz to the second LSC, and his election as chair, upset politics at the school. Boltz was an outsider with an agenda of his own. Actually, his agenda was that of Chicago school reform, and in his aggressive tone and abrasive style he came to personify the reform itself. Perhaps Boltz' most serious failing, from the perspective of his peers on the LSC, was his lack of sensitivity to their experiences, struggles and primary concerns. For example, while he desired to create opportunities for them to develop their leadership capacities and knowledge base, they struggled to ensure that their children were well treated and fed. Ironically, all of the resources that Boltz brought to the council--his life experiences outside of the projects, his knowledge of the school reform law, his familiarity with participatory decision-making, and his good intentions--had little effect, because the community did not trust him. It took Boltz almost a full academic year on the council to realize that he could not accomplish anything because he was not a member of the family, and he was out of touch with their needs. Consequently, when the LSC ousts Boltz as chair, the school community believes that they have accomplished two objectives: They have returned Radner to his leadership position, and they have thwarted a new politics and reinstated the old.

The Time Frame for Reform, Leadership Development, and Spillover to the Broader Community

Perhaps even more interesting than the era when Boltz was chair, was his residual impact on the council after he left. While everyone we interviewed insisted that Boltz was without lasting influence, we saw it differently.

The council expressed relief that Boltz was gone, but in subtle ways they behaved differently in his absence, and differently than they had before he had arrived on the scene. In contrast to the first and second councils, the third LSC (which was made up of several holdovers from the second) was unwilling to accept the status quo in areas where they felt comfortable of their expertise--lunchroom operations and security. Several members did not hesitate to challenge staff and even the principal when they saw situations in need of correction. Perhaps they were emboldened by Boltz' leadership style. Alternatively, they may have been provoked by the controversial dynamics that he created. Regardless of the reason, some of the members who were most strongly opposed to Boltz, like Mrs. Green, took up where he left off. Whereas Green had always sided with the principal in the past, she felt free to question his decisions and even put forward alternatives after Boltz' departure. As she learned more about the limits of local control, Mrs. Green realized that it was not always enough to agree with and/or support Radner since he did not have jurisdiction over the lunchroom or security staff. Rather, Green learned to strategize with the principal. She and other parent members discovered that it was up to them--in concert with Radner--to define and solve problems in these areas. The third council was staking out its own domains of leadership and decision-making, and these were wholly concerned with the environmental issues. Holiday's parent-dominated council left to the principal and faculty all of the issues that are traditionally in the professional domain; for

example, school planning, budgeting and personnel. Consequently, leadership on the council was developing, but not with regard to the educational issues anticipated by reform advocates.

Similarly, there was no evidence that parents' participation on the LSC had any carry over to affairs of the broader community. At the start of reform this was a neighborhood where organizers were unable to rally residents to a job action. With the exception of Tim Mears, the other parents elected to the LSC had been dedicated school volunteers and/or paid aides prior to the passage of reform, and the school was still the sole focus of their activism four years later. Mears represented the only avenue to a broader community involvement during the period of our observations. With his departure, first from the chairmanship and then from the council, the LSC effectively lost its only window to issues of community reform.

How can we evaluate the unfolding of reform in this particular school community? Was it a success or failure? Is there evidence from this case that the goals of school reformers and/or community activists were met? The answer, in short, is no. The Holiday story provides no evidence that parents even wanted much less assumed a strong governance role. Neither did they show any interest in exerting their influence in educational issues. Similarly, there is no spillover to affairs of the broader community.

These judgements, however, seem too severe and cursory to us because they overlook the positive developments that we did observe in this school. A more subtle and fair perspective might be to consider, as we have done, the base state of the school community at the advent of reform, and what positive developments--if any--the reform fostered? Holiday's LSC became a new institution the members of which were able to solve school-based problems; for example, security issues in the building and also the adequacy of the lunchroom food.

Most importantly, while there was no spillover to the broader community, participation on the LSC was a vehicle that enabled some parents to develop rudimentary civic skills. In 1994 parents on the third council were strategizing with their principal to get things done. This stands in strong contrast, to the dynamic we found in 1991 on the first (and second) councils when parents functioned as children in a family style politics. Thus the LSC engaged parents in the issues and discourse of a civic society where they were learning--albeit slowly--critical citizenship skills. What these developments call into question then is not the positive nature of Chicago's reform, but rather its attenuated time frame. In a school community as disadvantaged as this one, five years is an insufficient time frame for the development of participatory democracy and high functioning local institutions. In a community as disadvantaged as this one, a much longer trajectory is needed.

The Principal's Role

Key to understanding the unfolding of events at Holiday were the actions of the principal. Throughout the field work we asked ourselves if we thought he was a "good" or a "bad" principal, and whether the politics that he leads is a good or a bad pattern for the school. As noted in the case, there were many times when we were skeptical of Radner's motives. One example was when he hired Hall and then Campbell and took them off of the LSC. Another was when he asked his first council for approval of the SIP and budget, but did not think it necessary or even appropriate to train them on the development of these documents. A third was when Boltz came onto the council and Radner felt compelled to change his budget presentation. A fourth was when he effectively removed Boltz as council chair in the middle of the school year. From our point of view Radner's justification for each of these actions was weak. Similarly, we expect that some of the authors of Chicago's reform,

and also some community organizers, would quarrel with Radner's behavior as his actions stymied the twin goals of parent development and empowerment.

Chicago's reform advanced another goal, however, that is more subtle than parent empowerment and less well understood. Bryk et al. argue that by taking away principal's tenure, the law used a strong arm tactic to achieve a difficult objective. It aimed to reconnect schools with their communities, and in-so-doing, recreate them as more responsive, local institutions. Radner's commitment to the children and their families enabled this goal to be met. He both needed and encouraged this community to work with him. He was sensitive to their hardships and responsive to their needs. They, in turn, trusted him. Most importantly, parents attribute a large measure of their participation to the welcoming environment that he and his professional staff created for them. When judged from the vantage point of strengthening the school's ties with its community, and also from the perspective of parents, Radner was a huge success. We must note, however, that Radner's attitude and behavior toward Holiday's parents and community had little--if anything--to do with reform. He came into the community seven years prior to its passage knowing that he needed to "work on his rapport." Both he and his parents explain his longevity at the school as based on relations of mutual trust and caring. This case provides no evidence that a law can be a lever to generate such ties.

Left unanswered when we ended our observations of this school community are the productive limits of consolidated principals' power. While Radner's leadership and this pattern of politics seems to be "good" for this school community at this particular stage of its development, it is unclear what will happen in the future. At issue is whether members of the LSC will continue to develop their skills, and whether their partnership with Radner will maintain its focus on issues of

environmental order or eventually move into additional domains of school decision making. If and when this happens the school community will have entered a new phase of politics, and left consolidated principals' power behind.

Endnotes

1.The Community Workshop on Economic Development is a coalition of 41 CBOs in Chicago. Each year CWED hosts a series of workshops and conferences as a way of creating discussion among community development practitioners on the newest policies, issues and strategies that impact the field.

2.The Rainbow Coalition refers to the diverse group that came together to support Washington's elections and program while he was Mayor. It splintered following his death.

3.See Rubin, 1992. The reduction of government and foundation funding for community organizing is discussed and alternative directions are explored.

4.Wilson, 1987.

5.See Fein in Levin (1970) for discussion of the links between community control and community organizing.

6.In fact, Washington's death came on the eve of the first of a series of community forums that were scheduled to generate public interest and elicit citizens' advice about the future of the schools and the law that was aimed at changing them. See Wong & Rollow, 1990.

7.See Katz, Simon & Fine, 1991.

8.Moore, 1990; Hess, 1991.

9.See PA 85-1418. See also Bryk, et al. 1993 for a discussion of the goals and mandates of Chicago school reform.

10.Evans & Boyte, 1992, p. 192. The authors define "citizenship skills" as the ability to "speak in public, run meetings, analyze problems and their sources, write leaflets, and so forth--the sort of skills that are essential to sustaining democracy."

11.This is a reference to the voter registration drive that helped Harold Washington win office.

12. Alinsky, 1946.

13.Wilson, 1987; Bobo, Kendall & Max, 1995.

14.These conclusions were not unlike those of the organizers involved in New York City's community control movement in the 1960's. A big difference between the two movements, however, was the worsening conditions of many African American neighborhoods in the inner city.

15.Easton, et al. 1993b.

16.Bryk & Schneider, forthcoming.

17.Bryk, Rollow & Pinnell, 1996.

18.Bryk et al. 1993.

19.Holiday is a pseudonym, as are the names of all participants. Some minor details and descriptions have been changed throughout the case to protect the identity of this school and its community.

20.Bryk & Rollow, 1992; Hess, 1991; Moore, 1990.

21.See Rollow & Bryk in Marshall.

22.Putnam, 1993, p. 171.

23.Bryk et al. 1993.

24.Bryk et al. 1993, p. 6.

25.Two scenarios have been found to promote strong democracy. The first pattern reveals a history of positive social relations between parents and professionals. The second is one where the LSC hires a new principal, and then supports her efforts to implement change. See discussion of the Experiences of Actively Restructuring Schools in Bryk et al, 1993.

26.For those unfamiliar with Chicago school reform, we also offer a brief primer on the law itself:

Public Act 85-1418 (PA 45-1418) sought to weaken central decision-making and to promote greater site-based control by devolving authority to local schools. Reform gave principals greater authority over the school budget, the physical building, and some personnel decisions. For the first time principals freed from seniority requirements were able to recruit and hire new teachers. Having lost their tenure and now accountable to their Local School Council (LSC), principals were encouraged to redirect initiative toward local constituencies and their concerns.

The reform package also created a real voice for parents and community members because each group has representatives on the LSC. These parent-majority councils have the power to hire and fire the school principal, and to approve the budget and the School Improvement Plan (SIP). Teachers were also given an expanded voice. Through their two seats on the LSC, they have direct influence on school affairs, including the choice of principal, and advisory responsibility over school curriculum and instruction through the teacher-nominated Professional Personnel Advisory Committee (PPAC).

New resources also became available to support school improvements. PA 85-1418 changed how state compensatory education funds (Chapter I funds) were to be used. Money now flows to each school based on the proportion of disadvantaged students. Schools with a high percentage of disadvantaged students received substantial increases in discretionary dollars and greater freedom regarding how they should be spent. The district previously used these funds as general aid.

To guide the local school change process, the School Reform Act also formulated explicit educational goals for children and an extended set of school objectives. Principals were required to

develop three-year improvement plans subject to LSC approval. The central office was charged with reporting annually on the progress of schools and developing a system wide plan to support local initiatives. The intent was to use the instruments of planning, evaluation, and budgeting to focus local efforts on improvements in educational quality and student learning.

Thus, considered as a whole, the Chicago School Reform Act is a complex piece of legislation, much more sophisticated and subtle than it is often portrayed in media reports and critical commentary. It is also highly ambitious--nothing less than a complete restructuring of the third largest public school system in America was intended.

27.Chicago is divided into 76 community areas. To protect the anonymity of the school community, we omit the numerical designation of the area where Holiday school is located.

28. U.S. Census, 1990.

29.Axinn & Levin, 1992.

30. Chicago Community Fact Book, 1980; Community Analysis Project Report No. 6, 1975.

31.Roosevelt University urbanologist Pierre deVise used per capita incomes reported in 1990 Census to rank the poorest areas in the country. For a further discussion see the *Chicago Tribune* January 26, 1995 Section 2 page 1.

32.Unofficial estimates by social service providers in the area put the figure closer to 60%.

33. Chicago Community Fact Book, 1980.

34.The future of the buildings is currently in doubt as Vincent Lane has recently resigned, and the federal department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which has taken over all of the CHA, has yet to announce its plans.

35.Gerald Suttles (1968, p. 34) studied a similar area in the 1960's and concluded that territorial allegiances were much stronger than race when it came to gang conflict. He observed:

All that divides the Mexicans, Negroes, Italians, and Puerto Ricans in the Addams area from their fellow nationals in other areas are roads, vacant lots, and buildings. Yet, once they stand in opposition, they never seem to doubt that each street corner group within a single ethnic group will ally itself with other groups from the same territory. Moreover, there is the suspicion, if not the certainty, that all street corner groups within a territory might join forces irrespective of ethnicity.

More recently, Kotlowitz (1989, p.40) reports:

The Vice Lords, with the aid of another gang, pushed to oust the Disciples from the east end--the more populated section of the complex--and thus the more lucrative [for drug sales]. They even brought in thugs from other parts of the city.

36.Kotlowitz, 1989.

37.Harold Washington created a Citizens Review Board during his first term as mayor.

38.The old stadium was slated to be demolished and replaced on the adjoining land parcel by a state-of-the-art facility during the time of this research.

39.Dawson, 1993, p. 13. See also Cohen & Dawson, 1993; Berry et al. 1991.

40.At this time the central office assigned principals to schools.

41. Many principals were not rehired and their contracts were not renewed by the LSC. Others resigned when they determined that there would be continuous conflict between them and their LSCs. See Bryk et al. 1993 for more discussion.

42.Many principals were not rehired by their LSCs. others resigned when they determined that there would be continuous conflict between them and their LSCs. See Bryk et al. 1993 for discussion of "adversarial politics." See also Yanguas & Rollow, 1995.

43.See, for example, Hess (1991; 1992) & Moore (1990).

44.See, for example, Squires, 1989.

45.Again, we refer, to the writings of Hess (1991; 1992) & Moore (1990).

46.While all of the women on Holiday's council were unmarried, they generally referred to each other as "Mrs." We maintain their expression.

47.We asked Radner if he had asked Hall to serve on this committee because she was particularly qualified, or perhaps because he thought she might gain valuable experience and new leadership skills as a participant there. He seemed surprised and said that he had not thought of it from a leadership perspective. Rather, he said that it was a strategic decision because he knew the importance of having the school represented on bodies where policies initiatives were discussed and information was disseminated.

48.The Board of Education and numerous citywide training groups offered training sessions about the principal evaluation. Most encouraged an interview process with teachers, parents and students, as well as the use of a survey to measure the principals' effectiveness.

49.As an employee of the Chicago Public Schools, she was no longer eligible to sit on the council.

50.This is a parent liaison position in the CPS.

51.In fact, Hall continued to recruit parent volunteers and work with after-school programs.

52.Arnstein, who describes eight different levels of citizens' participation, labels this type of activity "informing." She describes it as a "degree of tokenism" and not real participation. See Arnstein, 1969.

53.When Hall left and Campbell became chair this created a parent vacancy. Campbell's first concern as chair was to fill the vacancy that her election had created, as well as the openings left by Roberts and the other parent.

54.In the original legislation parents and community representatives voted in their own categories. This provision was amended in 1992 such that parents and community members voted at large.

55.Heather first became active on the Parent Teacher Association and other parent committees at the school when her husband was elected chair.

56.The CPS has an open enrollment policy.

57.As mandated in PA 85-1418, Boltz also called a meeting at the end of the school year to report on the principal evaluation and other work of the LSC. Only the principal came.

58. Each school has fixed expenses that must be "applied" to specific line items for operations. The "unapplied" amount that Radner refers to is the discretionary money that flows to each local school as a result of PA 85-1418. Because Holiday was racially isolated, and served low income students whose achievement was low, it had a significant amount of discretionary funds. Holiday also received Creating a New Approach to Learning (CANAL) funds. This program was an activity of the district, started the year prior to reform, and funded by federal desegregation money. It was an attempt to introduce site-based management and participatory decision-making to local schools. There was some discussion of school improvement as well.

59.In fact, according to PA 85-1418 the LSC was elected for a two year term, unless the council found cause for early dismissal. It was possible for LSCs to write into their By-laws a provision that the LSC chair hold a shorter term. Holiday's LSC, however, had never developed By-laws.

60.For more discussion of the importance of trust, see Schneider & Bryk, 1995.

61.In the CPS the principal supervises the faculty. Lunchroom and engineering staff belong to different unions and are supervised by a district manager, not the principal. Specific operations, however, like menu planning, are centrally controlled.

62.At the next meeting, Davis returned with a detailed schedule for patroling the building and the grounds during the school day.

63.Bryk, et al. 1993. Note too that Holiday is one of the twenty-two case study schools reported about in this "midpoint evaluation."

64.Squires, 1989.

References

Alinsky, S. (1946). *Reveille for radicals*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Alkalimat, A. & Gills, D. (1989). *Harold Washington and the crisis of Black power in Chicago*. Chicago: Twenty-First Century Books and Publications.

Arnstein, S. (1969). Eight rungs on the ladder of citizen participation. In Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett (Eds.), *Citizens participation: A case book in democracy*. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey Community Action Training Institute.

Axinn, J. and Levin, H. (1992). *Social welfare: A history of the American response to need (3rd ed.)*. New York: Longman.

Berry, J.M., Portney, K.E., and Thomson, K. (1991). The political behavior of poor people. In C. Jencks and P. E. Peterson (Eds.), *The urban underclass*. Washington: Brookings Institution.

Bennett, A.L., Bryk, A.S., Easton, J.Q., Kerbow, D., Luppescu, S., and Sebring, P.A. (1992). *Charting reform: The principals' perspective*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Bobo, K., Kendall, J., and Max, S. Cleaning up in the nineties. In J. Rothman, J. Erlich, and J.E. Tropman (Eds.), *Strategies of community intervention*. Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Brager, G., Specht, H., and Torczyner, J.L. (1987). *Community organizing* (2nd ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Bryk, A.S., Easton, J.Q., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S.G., and Sebring, P.A. (1993). *A view from the elementary schools: The state of reform in Chicago. A technical report sponsored by the Consortium on Chicago School Research*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Bryk, A.S., Easton, J.Q., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S.G., and Sebring, P.A. (forthcoming). *Democratic participation and organizational change: The Chicago school experience*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

Bryk, A.S., and Rollow, S.G. (1992, Fall). The Chicago experiment: Enhanced democratic participation as a lever for school improvement. Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. *Issues in restructuring schools, 3*.

Chicago Fact Book Consortium (Ed.). (1984). *Local community fact book, Chicago metropolitan area: Based on the 1970 & 1980 census*. Chicago: Chicago Review Press.

Chicago School Reform Act, Illinois General Assembly. Public Act 85-1418 (1988).

Cohen, C.J., and Dawson, M.C. (June, 1993). Neighborhood poverty and African American politics. *American Political Science Review, 87* (2), 292-29.

Comer, J.P. (1980). *School power: Implications of an intervention project.* New York: The Free Press.

Community Analysis Project Report No.6. City of Chicago Department of Planning, 1975, p.5.

Dawson, M. (1993). Alone in the crowd: The political isolation of poverty. *Chicago Tribune.* Chicago: Section 1, p. 13.

deVise, Pierre. (1995). *Chicago Tribune.* Chicago: Section 2, p. 1.

Easton, J.Q., Bryk, A.S., Driscoll, M.E., Kotsakis, J.G., Sebring, P.A., and van der Ploeg, A.J. (1993). *Charting reform: The teachers' turn.* Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Easton, J.Q., Flinspach, S.L., O'Connor, C., Paul, M., Qualls, J., and Ryan, S.P. (1993). *Local school governance: The third year of Chicago school reform.* Chicago: Chicago Panel on Public School Policy and finance.

Elmore, R.F. (1991). *Restructuring schools: The next generation of reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.

Epstein, J.L. (1995). *School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share.* Phi Delta Kappan, 76 (9), 701-13.

Evans, S.M., and Boyte, H.C. (1986). *Free spaces: The sources of democratic change in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fein, L.J.(1980). Community and social theory: The limits of universalism. In H. M. Levin (Ed.), *Community control of schools.* Washington: The Brookings Institution.

Green, T.F. (1969). Schools and communities: A look forward. *Harvard Educational Review, 39* (2).

Hess, G.A. (1991). *School restructuring, Chicago style.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Hess, G.A. (Ed.) (1992). *Empowering teachers and parents: School restructuring through the eyes of anthropologists.* Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Jackson, P.W. & Gurin, G. (1987). *National survey of Black Americans, 1979-1980.* Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research.

Katz, M.B., Fine, M., and Simon, E. (1991). Chicago School Reform: A view from the outside. *Chicago Tribune*. Chicago: Section 1, p. 27.

Knoepfle, P. (Ed.) (1990). *After Alinsky: Community organizing in Illinois*. Springfield, IL: Illinois Issues, Sangamon State University.

Kotlowitz, A. (1991). *There are no children here: The story of boys growing up in the other America*.

McKersie, W.S. (1993, Summer). Philanthropy's paradox: Chicago school reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15 (2), 109-128.

Moore, D.R. (1990). Voice and choice in Chicago. In W.H. Clune and J.F. Witte (Eds.), *Choice and control in American education: Vol. 2. The practice of choice, decentralization and school restructuring* (pp. 153-198). Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Olsen, M. (1968). *The logic of collective action*. New York: Schoken Books.

Putnam, R.D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rollow, S.G., and Bryk, A.S. (April, 1993). *Catalyzing professional community in a school reform left behind*. In K.S. Louis and S.D. Kruse, *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*.

Rollow, S.G., and Bryk, A.S. (Spring, 1993). The Chicago experiment: The potential and reality of reform. *Choice and equality*. 9(3): 22-32.

Rollow, S.G., and Bryk, A.S. (1993). Democratic politics and school improvement: The potential of Chicago school reform. In C. Marshall (Ed.), *The new politics of race and gender. The 1993 yearbook of the politics of education*. London: Falmer Press.

Rubin H.J., and Rubin I.S. (1992) *Community organizing and development* (2nd Ed.). New York: MacMillian Publishing Co.

Schneider, B., and Bryk, A.S. (1995). *Trust as a moral resource: Constructive social relations in urban school communities*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Invitational Conference on Social Capital, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI.

Schneider, B., and Coleman, J.S. (Eds.) (1993). *Parents, their children, and schools*. San Francisco: Westview Press.

Sebring, P.A., Bryk, A.S., Luppescu, S., and Thum, Y. (1995). *Charting reform in Prairie School: Results of student and teacher surveys*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research

Sebring, P.B., Bryk, A.S., and Easton, J.Q. (forthcoming). *Charting reform: Chicago teachers take stock.* Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research.

Squires, J.D. (1988). *Preface to Chicago schools: Worst in America.* Chicago: R.R. Donnelley & Sons.

Suttles, G.D. (1968). *The social order of the slum.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

U.S. Census 1990.

Verba, S. and Nie, N.H. (1972). *Participation in America: Political democracy and social equality.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

West, E.H. (1967). Home-school relationships. *Journal of Negro Education, 39.*

Wilson, W.J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wong, K., and Rollow, S.G. (1990). A case study of the recent Chicago school reform. *Administrator's Notebook, 34* (6). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yanguas, J., and Rollow, S.G. (1994). *The rise and fall of adversarial politics in the context of Chicago School Reform: Parent participation in a Latino school community.* Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.